


H Q
796
P56
Public
Health

UC-NRLF



C 3 303 999

1911



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE HAIGHT-ASHBURY HIPPIE COMMUNITY

SEPTEMBER 1968

(C) 1968

Stephen M. Pittel, Ph.D.
Department of Psychiatry
Mount Zion Hospital and
Medical Center

Handwritten:
1/4nd
cut for 1st
Haight Ashbury
C

PUBLIC HEALTH

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION

VOLUME 12

Published by the
AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION
1201 K STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.
Subscription price, \$5.00 per annum in advance.
Single copies, 15 cents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Acknowledgements	1
Introduction	3
The Hippie Culture in Transition	6
Drug Use in the Haight-Ashbury	12
Runaways to the Haight-Ashbury	25
Medical and Psychiatric Problems in the Haight-Ashbury	32
Services Available to the Hippie Community	40
References	64

APPENDICES

- A. Selected Annotated Bibliography
- B. Psychiatric Descriptions of Some Hippie Types
- C. The Haight-Ashbury Research Project

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared as a service to the health and welfare agencies, local authorities and individuals of the San Francisco Bay Area who are concerned with the hippie community of the Haight-Ashbury District. Mrs. Jackson Chance, Executive Director of the Rosenberg Foundation of San Francisco, suggested the need for such a document and financial support for its preparation was generously provided by the Rosenberg Foundation and by Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center.

In the course of learning about the Haight-Ashbury and its hippie residents, I have had the opportunity to interview and have informal discussions with many observers and participants in the hippie scene, all of whom provided me with invaluable assistance in the preparation of this report. I would like to express my special gratitude to Chief Thomas Cahill of the San Francisco Police Department for making available to me the resources of his Department and to Captain Daniel Quinlan of the Juvenile Bureau, Lt. Norbert Currie of the Narcotics Squad, Captain Kenneth Fahs of the Park Police Precinct, Director Thomas Fitzpatrick of Police Intelligence and to the other officers of the Police Department who have consented to answer my innumerable questions about the activities of their departments. I would also like to thank Superior Court Judge Joseph Karesh, who has been most generous with his time and legal knowledge pertaining to violations of the Narcotics Act.

Dr. Seymour Solomon, Chief Psychiatrist at the Youth Guidance Center, and Mr. Warren Cain, Supervising Probation Officer, have been particularly helpful to me in obtaining data on runaways in San Francisco. Dr. Arthur Carfagni, Director, Immediate Psychiatric Aid Center, San Francisco General Hospital, Dr. Deanne Gottfried, Director of Health Center #2, S.F. Department of Public Health,

and Dr. Ernest Dernberg, Psychiatric Director of the Free Medical Clinic, have been major sources of information pertaining to medical and psychiatric problems in the hippie community.

Among the many others who deserve recognition for their assistance in providing the information in this report are Mr. Lon Burns, Managing Director of Huckleberry's for Runaways; Mrs. Adria Garabedian, Editor of the Haight-Ashbury Record; Father Leon Harris, Rector of All Saints Church; Miss Adrienne Pauley, Time Correspondent; Mr. Al Rinker, Founder and Director of the San Francisco Switchboard; Mr. Howard Rochford, Director of Off Ramp; Mr. Robert Strand, UPI staff writer; and Professor Leonard Wolf, former Director of Happening House.

My greatest sources of information have been the many hippies, hitchhikers, drug dealers, and young residents of the Bay Area, whose anonymity here is not intended to minimize the importance of their contribution to this report.

Finally, I would like to thank my research assistant, Mr. Bill Orr, who has worked with me throughout the preparation of this report, and the other staff members of the Haight-Ashbury Research Project who have shared with me their observations of the hippie culture and patiently awaited the completion of this report.

INTRODUCTION

For the past few years the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco has been the center and the symbol of an emerging youth culture. Based in part on the use of psychedelic drugs and on the rejection of many of the traditional mores and prohibitions of the adult society, the hippie movement has evolved a life style and an ideology which has attracted to it thousands of youths throughout the country. The Haight-Ashbury hippie community has often been the source of the ideas and innovations which have come to characterize the hippie movement and, along with New York's East Village and Los Angeles's Sunset Strip, remains one of the major hippie encampments in the country. The dissemination of information about the Haight-Ashbury through the mass media and by the many visitors to the community has had a profound effect in setting trends for the hippie movement and the Haight-Ashbury has been used to form generalizations and conclusions about the hippie phenomenon as a whole. As other hippie sub-cultures develop, the attention given the Haight-Ashbury as a prototype of the movement may decline but, at the present time, the Haight-Ashbury remains synonymous with the hippies and an understanding of its culture an important social and scientific goal.

This report, which will describe the current status of the Haight-Ashbury hippie culture and indicate how it has developed and changed in the recent past, is intended to provide necessary information about the culture to the many interested individuals who come into contact with the hippies. It is also intended to set the stage for a major inter-disciplinary research project which has recently begun a long term study of the Haight-Ashbury and its inhabitants.

Despite the many popular articles written about the Haight-Ashbury and the already growing body of scientific literature on the subject, there are areas of interest which have not yet received adequate coverage. Some information about the Haight-Ashbury has been ignored because it has no apparent significance in understanding the larger hippie movement, while other facts have been exaggerated because they seem the basis for generalization. The more exotic

or bizarre phenomena of the hippie culture have received their share of coverage, while more subtle or less manifest aspects of the culture are known only to those who live and work in the Haight-Ashbury. Other distortions in reporting on the hippie culture have resulted from the selection of information designed to support the often opinionated views of each of the many observers and reporters.

The information contained in this report has been obtained from a number of sources, including firsthand observation of the Haight-Ashbury community over a six-month period and interviews with many residents and workers in the neighborhood. With few exceptions my informants have tended to fall into one of two groups: the apologists or the moralists. The former group tends to focus on the positive value orientation of the hippies, their quest for personal identity, and on the marked contrast between the hippies' honesty and the hypocrisy of established society. This group tends to minimize the importance of the numerous problems of the Haight-Ashbury and its residents by attributing the majority of these to the establishment which refuses to recognize or honor the rights of these young idealists. When confronted with the realistic problems of violence, disease, and personal crisis, the apologists point out that the Haight-Ashbury has undergone a major transition since the end of the summer of 1967. They argue that the area has attracted a large number of degenerates, criminals, hard-core drug users, and various types of exploiters who find the hippies to be easy prey. They maintain the Utopian image of the hippie "flower children" while ignoring the problems with which they are plagued.

The moralists, on the other hand, tend to focus on the negative aspects of the hippie scene. Even while acknowledging their concern for these young people the moralists seem more concerned with the outward manifestations of the hippie life than with the motives which underlie it. They are concerned about the slovenly dress, and uncleanness of the hippies, with their sexual behavior, and with problems of drug abuse. They point out the violence, destructiveness,

and criminality which to them characterizes the hippie scene. Although this group also recognizes that the Haight Ashbury has changed since the summer of 1967, one gets the impression that their current views are not based solely on the contemporary scene. Rather, they tend to minimize the idealism of the past and claim that the current picture is only an exaggeration of problems long in existence.

Wherever possible, I have tried to document observations with statistical information obtained through various local and state agencies and to support the authenticity of subjective reports of potentially biased informants by providing a number of contrasting views on the same subject. My focus in collecting information about the Haight-Ashbury has been toward those topics of greatest interest to health and mental health workers and toward the topics of greatest concern to the social scientists, psychiatrists and psychologists who make up the working staff of the Haight-Ashbury Research Project.

The body of this report will deal with a variety of topics descriptive of the Haight-Ashbury culture with special emphasis placed on the health and welfare needs and resources of the community. A bibliography of relevant literature and a series of brief case histories chosen to illustrate some of the problems discussed in the report will be appended. The final section of the report will provide the reader with an overview of the research plans and design of the Haight-Ashbury Research Project, whose work in the neighborhood officially commenced on June 15, 1968. As this report is intended to provide information to the staff of the Project about the psychosocial context of their research, it will not attempt to prejudge any of the complex and difficult issues which they will focus on for the next few years. Speculation and theorizing about the significance of the hippie phenomena or about any specific observations has been kept to a minimum in this report and it is hoped that no particular biases of this writer will detract from the objectivity intended.

The Hippie Culture in Transition

Most observers of the Haight-Ashbury are agreed that the culture has undergone a dramatic transition since its beginning in the winter and spring of 1967. While the original hippies or "Flower Children" brought to the community a beautiful vision of establishing a free society based on love and mutual sharing, and, thus, initially gained the support of the older residents of the neighborhood, the current hippie population is seen as an ugly perversion of these ideals. It is generally believed that the hippie experiment in the Haight-Ashbury died its inevitable death after the summer of 1967 and that the true hippies have left only to be replaced by youths in search of mere kicks, drugs and sex. Those who still adhere to the hippie ethos of love and freedom are reputed to have settled in hippie communes in rural areas or to have moved to other low rental districts of the city where they have established tribes or families whose activities will not come into open conflict with the authorities or be perverted by the influx of less sincere individuals.

This view of the current scene is common to both friends and opponents of the hippies and seems to be shared by many of the hippies themselves. One hippie girl summarized the change in the culture quite simply by stating that "...the joy is gone from the streets." In the sections that follow, some of these changes in the Haight-Ashbury will seem apparent while others are too intangible to be expressed in terms of statistics or even words. My own observations of the Haight-Ashbury leave me with the impression that the motives of many of the youths who arrive in the Haight-Ashbury today are compatible with the original hippie ethos but they are unable to bring about these idealistic goals in the face of unpleasant and often oppressive pressures brought to bear upon them. That the Haight-Ashbury is also attracting individuals who have little in common with the idealized portrait of the hippie as Utopian is also quite correct and such individuals are now as important in understanding the Haight-Ashbury cul-

ture as are their hippie counterparts.

The first hippie types came to the Haight-Ashbury in 1963 and 1964. A number of them had probably already begun to "drop out" from traditional school and work careers, perhaps having experienced LSD and marijuana on their college campuses, but the majority were simply students and young college graduates who were seeking the comforts of the inexpensive although attractive Victorian apartments of the district. By January of 1965, the Psychedelic Shop had opened its doors on Haight Street to serve the needs of the "new community" of the Haight-Ashbury and other "turned on" people who were finding the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood tolerant of their strange clothes and loud music. As more people with similar interests and ideas gravitated to the Haight-Ashbury, there seemed to develop a sense of community which was solidified by the establishment of the I-Thou Coffee House on Haight Street where they congregated, and by their participation in the Rock concerts and dances frequently presented in local ballrooms and auditoriums. There was, of course, an even greater sense of shared identity produced by their use of drugs such as marijuana and LSD, which were both difficult to obtain and, in the case of marijuana, illegal. Happenings such as Ken Kesey's Trips Festival and Acid Tests, which brought together many people with similar involvements and beliefs, also contributed to the growing hippie ethos and with it to the recognition that a new culture was beginning to take shape in the Haight-Ashbury.

According to Leonard Wolf (1968), there was a conscious decision made to use rituals as a basis for unifying the community. The first major happening designed to bring about this end was the highly successful Human Be-In, staged in Golden Gate Park in January 1967. This event drew a crowd estimated by the news media at 15,000 and by the hippie spokesmen at 50,000. It had been organized at short notice by some of the early leaders of the community to celebrate the "ingathering of the tribes" and was, according to even the most conservative reports, a festive exhibition of all that the hippie culture had

to offer. Many, if not most, of the participants were "high" on marijuana or other psychedelic drugs; electronic rock music dominated the scene while individuals dressed in Eastern religious garb mingled with those whose costumes were merely bizarre and colorful; long haired, barefooted hippies gave away flowers, drugs and even money to strangers. The atmosphere was permeated by happiness and friendship and a sense of importance, as well as intimacy, was spontaneously created. The Human Be-In was the stimulus for the news coverage which was to bring thousands of youths to the Haight-Ashbury in the forthcoming months.

To the leaders of the hippie community who had channeled the energies of their heterogeneous followers into this spontaneous expression of freedom, the Be-In signified the beginning of a new culture in San Francisco. They prophesied in the following months that 100,000 or perhaps even 200,000 youths would come to the Haight-Ashbury when school was out in June. While preparations were being made for this flowering of the Haight-Ashbury by the hippies, various city authorities and professionals began to anticipate the problems that might emerge if these predictions actually came to pass.

Official statements from the office of the Mayor and the Chief of Police warned the hippies that they would not be welcome in San Francisco. Regulations prohibiting sleeping in Golden Gate Park were enacted and officials of the Department of Public Health warned of the diseases that might reach epidemic proportions if so many people of this type were crowded into the Haight-Ashbury. Complaints from residents of the Haight-Ashbury community about infractions of the Health code in hippie pads gave credence to these projections and caused much concern, even among those sympathetic to the hippie cause.

Abstracts of a few newspaper articles appearing in the spring of 1967 give some indication of the concerns generated by the predicted influx and suggest the antipathy shown the hippies by the establishment:

March 23, 1967: Mayor Shelley asks Supervisors to publicly oppose hippie migration. He stresses that all laws will be strictly

enforced.

Officials of the Municipal Transportation Company request permission to reroute buses around Haight-Ashbury to avoid congestion.

March 27, 1967: Police Chief Cahill supports the Recreation Department's ban on sleeping in Golden Gate Park. He is critical of the Diggers whom he believes are encouraging runaways and are opposed to law and order.

Teams of Inspectors from the Department of Public Health raided Haight-Ashbury apartments to investigate violations of the Health code. The Director of the Department claims that the hippies are creating a slum.

May 5, 1967: Two to three times the normal number of runaways are being apprehended by the Police who fear there may be a nation-wide communications network circulating lists of places where food and shelter are available. A Probation Officer warns of an "Underground Railroad" for runaways in California coastal cities. The Diggers who are providing return trips as well as other services for runaways may face child stealing charges if the problem continues. The Diggers claim that they had asked for help in setting up temporary shelters for runaways but the city had refused to cooperate.

In the face of considerable legal and practical opposition, the hippies themselves began to develop resources necessary to meet the needs of their community. With great enthusiasm, they found means to provide free food, shelter, clothes and a variety of services to the Haight-Ashbury community.

While the success of the Be-In could be measured in terms of community spirit and a rapidly growing hippie population, the Haight-Ashbury culture

had already begun its decline by the beginning of the summer. In addition to the increasing number of arrests for violations of the narcotics law, violence began to be seen in the midst of the love culture. Members of the community were exploiting the situation for personal pleasure and profit to the detriment of the trusting and often naive hippies. New drugs introduced during the summer proved to be more powerful and more dangerous than marijuana and LSD and caused a number of psychiatric and medical casualties. As the summer progressed, the quality and availability of drugs declined and prices climbed. Amphetamine use became widespread in the Haight-Ashbury among youths who showed little ideological resemblance to the hippies and who often preyed upon them. Merchants who had been willing to provide materials for free food distribution put limits on their generosity and other benefactors of the community were unwilling to provide help to people who were clearly not representatives of the love generation. An increasing number of those coming to the Haight-Ashbury were young adolescents who were subject to immediate arrest as runaways. Many of these youths were unable to provide for themselves on the streets and required a greater outpouring of effort from the hippie community to keep them out of trouble.

As the summer progressed and the older hippies realized that they would be waging a continual war against the establishment, groups of them began to establish communal tribes in rural areas throughout the West and Southwest. Faced with the problem of dealing with ever larger numbers of people in need of services, while rejecting the concept of leadership needed to organize these services, the hippies' projects began to deteriorate and finally close.

By October of 1967, as the summer migrants had left the Haight-Ashbury and the community was left without its previous sense of purpose and commitment, a ritual Funeral was staged announcing the death of the hippie movement. As conceived by the leaders of the hippie community, this Funeral was intended only to disperse the hippies away from the Haight-Ashbury, which had outlived its

usefulness as a means of producing a group identity. Another explanation given for the Funeral was that it was meant to reduce the power of some leaders who had attempted to influence the hippie culture and was intended to bring about a return to the spontaneity inherent in the movement.

For a number of months following the Funeral, the Haight-Ashbury community seemed to be existing at a minimal level of activity and enthusiasm. New conflicts with the police and new patterns of drug use suggested that the hippies had gone and had been replaced by less desirable and less ideologically committed individuals.

Just as the Human Be-In was a dramatization of events which had been taking shape in the Haight-Ashbury for some time before, the hippie Funeral which took place only ten months later symbolized the transition of the Haight-Ashbury from a scene of joy into one of despair. The situation today is perhaps more heterogeneous than it has been in the past. Hippies with a Utopian concept of freedom and an ideology based on love co-exist with disturbed and delinquent youths who are exploiting the freedom of the culture for their own purposes. Some of those who had left last summer have returned to the Haight-Ashbury to renew their attempts to bring about a youth revolution based on the hippie ethos. Most observers of the scene claim that there is less cohesiveness in the Haight-Ashbury today than in the past and that even the real hippies seem more militant in their demands for the "new community."

Speculations about the significance of the past history of the Haight-Ashbury or projections into the future based on past events are likely to be inaccurate unless there is a clear recognition that the hippie phenomenon is not one but a combination of many elements. This brief historical sketch of the Haight-Ashbury hippie culture is therefore offered only to provide the background against which each of these many elements can be separately viewed.

Drug Use in the Haight-Ashbury

The single most important characteristic of the hippie culture of the Haight-Ashbury, and perhaps the source of many of its values and activities, is the use of mind-altering drugs. The beginnings of the hippie culture coincide quite closely with the advocacy of LSD by the prophets of the psychedelic cult and the championship of the drug experience and its psychological effects is prevalent in all aspects of the culture.

While no reliable statistics are available to indicate the extent of drug use in the Haight-Ashbury, it is not unreasonable to assume that virtually all members of the community have had some experience with marijuana and a majority have used stronger psychedelic agents, such as LSD. All of these drugs, as well as a wide variety of others having similar psychological effects, have been available in the Haight-Ashbury hippie culture since its inception. The range of drugs used to produce the psychedelic experience or "trip" is immense and includes natural agents, such as mescaline, peyote, morning glory seeds, woodrose, and marijuana, as well as chemically produced synthetics, such as LSD, STP (or DOM), THC, DMT, DPT, and psilocybin. In addition to the psychedelic drugs, opiates, barbiturates, amphetamines and tranquilizers are used to a greater or lesser extent by various subgroups within the culture. A variety of exotic psychedelic agents and other drugs have also appeared occasionally in the Haight-Ashbury but the extent of their use is negligible when compared to the staples listed above.

Some indication of the extent of drug use in the Haight-Ashbury may be obtained through an examination of statistics concerning drug arrests in San Francisco. The data on total number of arrests includes those of heroin addicts which has increased only slightly in the years to be considered. The total number of narcotic arrests increased from 1,100 in 1963, to 4,096 in 1967. While the number of arrests had been steadily increasing since 1963, such increases had been relatively small until 1967, when there was an 85% jump from the previous

year's total. A breakdown of the arrest figures for 1967 shows a monthly increase in the number of arrests through the year, reaching an average of 450 arrests per month or about 15 per day, by the last quarter of the year. The contribution of the Haight-Ashbury to these figures is estimated by the San Francisco Police Department to be about 39% of the city-wide total.

Almost half (49%) of the adults and almost two thirds (65.5%) of the juveniles included in these data were charged with violations of the marijuana laws. Approximately two hundred pounds (86.99 kilograms) of marijuana was reported to have been handled by the Police Crime Laboratory during 1967, suggesting, if this represents the total amount confiscated in the arrests cited, that the average person arrested for violation of the marijuana laws possessed between one and two ounces of marijuana when apprehended. When one considers that a number of large quantities of marijuana have been confiscated in some arrests, the average drops considerable below this estimate.

The most dramatic shift in the pattern of narcotics violations in San Francisco is in the increase of juvenile arrests, the large majority of which are for violations of the marijuana laws. The number of juvenile narcotics arrests has increased from nine in 1963 to 446 in 1967, with a yearly increment averaging well over 150%.

It is important to note that the number of men available to the Narcotic Bureau of the Police Department has decreased over the past five years, making it unlikely that the increase in narcotic arrests is merely an artifact of increased police vigilance in this area of crime. Lieutenant Norbert Currie of the Narcotic Bureau claims that there has been no particular change in Police Department policy initiated by the drug violations in the Haight-Ashbury, due to the shortage of men available for a real crackdown in that area. Many of those arrested for violations of the narcotics law have been apprehended by Officers of Park Police District, which includes the Haight-Ashbury, for other infractions and have been found to possess drugs covered in the narcotics law.

Lieutenant Currie further states that most of the major drug arrests in the Haight-Ashbury have begun with the investigation of a few individuals, others becoming involved by their presence at the time of actual arrest.

Considering the availability and widespread use of drugs other than marijuana in the Haight-Ashbury, the official statistics of the Police Crime Laboratory on amounts of other drugs examined by that department are surprisingly small. Excluding heroin, opiates and barbiturates, which are less frequently found in the Haight-Ashbury, being more indigenous to the Fillmore District and other pockets of drug use, only amphetamines and LSD have been confiscated in significant quantities. Only 57 doses of peyote, six of DMT and apparently none of the other psychedelic drugs (e.g., mescaline, psilocybin, STP, etc.) are listed in the Crime Laboratory report for 1967. Over six thousand doses of amphetamines and over two thousand doses of LSD are listed in this report.

Marijuana and LSD, the two primary drugs of the Haight-Ashbury culture, were not in apparent use in San Francisco until 1964. Although members of the Beat Generation of the 1950's had introduced the use of marijuana to some extent (Rigney and Smith, 1961), this drug did not become a police problem until the beginning of the hippie culture. Synthetic hallucinogens, such as LSD, were first noticed in San Francisco in 1964, but, as these drugs were not considered to be illegal until October 1966, there is no record of the extent of their use in the city prior to that time. Informants have told me that LSD was available in San Francisco and Berkeley as early as 1960, but its use at that time was concentrated among a relatively small number of college students, many of whom used the drug under experimental conditions or under the supervision of professional psychotherapists.

Amphetamines, heroin, barbiturates and opiates have been in use in San Francisco for some time, with the greatest concentration of users in the lower-class neighborhoods of the city. These are the typical drugs of abuse associated with narcotic addiction and, with the exception of the amphetamines, have not

become a significant part of the drug taking habits of the hippie culture.

Even though the police statistics show a massive increase in the use of marijuana and other drugs during the past five years, at least part of which is attributable to the growth of the hippie culture, these data probably underestimate the actual extent of drug usage by a large factor. Taking marijuana as an example, one might estimate that the 2,000 individuals arrested for use of this drug in 1967 are but a small percentage of the marijuana using hippie population which passed through the Haight-Ashbury during that year. Using conservative estimates of the size of the hippie population at any given time (between 5,000 and 10,000) and considering the influx during the summer of 1967, and the rapid turnover of the hippie population, it is reasonable to assume that at least 100,000 marijuana users were in San Francisco in 1967. When one adds to this the information concerning marijuana use on college campuses and high schools in the area (Adler, 1966; Freedman, 1968; Korchin and Soskin, 1967), it is clear that the police data represent but a fraction of the actual marijuana use.

While marijuana has always been the most commonly used drug in the Haight-Ashbury community, its significance in shaping the hippie ethos is thought to be secondary to that of other, more powerful, psychedelic agents. Marijuana use, at least in the early days of the hippie culture, served as the backdrop against which LSD, STP, mescaline, and peyote, were taken to provide the "true" psychedelic experience. Unlike marijuana, which could be taken almost daily to produce trips of a few hours' duration, the stronger psychedelic drugs produced trips lasting from eight to twelve hours, and in the case of STP, as originally introduced in the Haight-Ashbury, from two to three days.

The profound psychological alterations produced by these stronger drugs, the tolerance developed by users to them, their higher price, and the religious mystique which accompanied their use in the hippie culture all contributed to their less frequent use in the community. Some members of the community preferred using marijuana because it did not interfere with their normal psycho-

logical functioning to as great an extent, while some avoided the use of the stronger drugs through fear of chromosomal damage, organic brain damage, or psychotic experiences which had been reputed to result from them. Reports of bad trips or adverse drug reactions were common in the Haight-Ashbury and many individuals shied away from the wanton use of drugs which were likely to produce so great an effect. Even those who did use the stronger psychedelic drugs often waited for some time before experimenting with them, and then took special pains in creating the proper circumstances for their use. The choice of time and place for a psychedelic trip were carefully considered by most users, at least for their first experience, and an experienced trip leader, guide, or guru was often at hand to help the novice in interpreting his psychedelic experience in terms of the mystique and to "talk him down" from a bad trip. Those who had had psychedelic experiences often became converts to the mystique and quickly took on the role of trip leader, feeling themselves capable of initiating others into the psychedelic culture.

The actual number of psychedelic trips taken by most members of the hippie community is probably quite small. While some advocates of the psychedelic mystique are reputed to have taken over 200 trips, the majority of those in the Haight-Ashbury community have probably not used LSD or other powerful psychedelics more than ten to twenty times. Compared to the use of marijuana on a daily basis or three to four times a week reported by the majority of hippies, the use of the stronger psychedelic agents is not nearly so great as has been represented by most observers. A number of the early leaders of the hippie community now feel that the claims made for LSD as a panacea have been magnified and a great number of them have attempted to create the transcendental psychedelic experience through religious meditation, dietary regulation, or other non-drug means. Much of the mystique surrounding the use of psychedelic drugs has dissipated in the Haight-Ashbury community and such drugs are now used less frequently by the ideologically pure hippies.

Amphetamine use in the Haight-Ashbury has co-existed with the use of psychedelic drugs and appears to be increasing significantly in the culture, though its psychological effects seem antithetical to those which initially sustained the hippie ideology. Through the summer of 1967, the amphetamine users were a relatively small and often isolated sub-group in the Haight-Ashbury. They were labeled as "speed freaks" and were considered by the large majority of the hippies to be on a "self-destructive trip." Drug salesmen or "dealers" who trafficked in psychedelic drugs did not typically deal in amphetamines and the amphetamine users were not considered reliable sources of drugs by the psychedelic using population. The socio-economic status and cultural background of the amphetamine users was generally lower than that of the hippies and the activities of the two groups were often quite disparate. Psychiatric observations of the two groups of drug users also suggested that they were quite different and the amphetamine users were seen as more similar to the traditional lower-class heroin user. This observation was supported by the knowledge that heroin users often supplemented their drug habit with amphetamines and that they used amphetamines as substitutes for heroin when the latter was not available. Heavy users of amphetamines typically prefer intravenous injection rather than oral ingestion of the drug, thus apparently increasing the likelihood of the alternate use of heroin.

A striking example of the different status of psychedelic and amphetamine users in the Haight-Ashbury may be found in the records of the Haight-Ashbury Free Medical Clinic and of San Francisco General Hospital. At the former medical facility, over three fourths of the "bad trips" or adverse drug reactions treated were precipitated by psychedelic drugs, while at the latter facility the same proportion of "bad trips" were attributable to amphetamine use.

While the Haight-Ashbury culture advocated the use of psychedelic drugs and saw these chemical agents as the source of creative energies and insights, an active campaign was being waged against the use of amphetamines. Signs pro-

claiming that "Speed Kills" were circulated through the neighborhood by the psychedelic users, thus winning the belief of the hippies who were suspicious of drug information distributed by the establishment. The synthetic psychedelic STP (DOM) which was first introduced in the Haight-Ashbury in early June of 1967, may have been rejected by the hippies in part because it became known as an amphetamine derivative. Unlike the psychedelic users, speed freaks, themselves, recognized that they were being physically and psychologically destroyed by their drug of choice and often referred to themselves as dope fiends. Those amphetamine users who had been able to free themselves from their drug use attempted to dissuade others from using amphetamines and some of them undertook the responsibility for "treating" other users of these drugs.

Since the end of the summer of 1967, the Haight-Ashbury has become increasingly an amphetamine rather than a psychedelic using culture. Whether this shift in the pattern of drug use reflects, as many observers have claimed, a change in the types of people coming to the Haight-Ashbury, or whether it has involved individual changes from psychedelics to amphetamines, this pattern now seems well established in the culture. A number of observers assert that the use of amphetamines in the Haight-Ashbury has always been at the currently high level but that it only became noticeable when the users of psychedelic drugs became less visible in the culture. Although the image of the amphetamines and the amphetamine users remains highly negative, there now seems to be less social differentiation of these two groups of drug users in the culture. Also, while predominant use of one or another type of drug seemed to characterize the drug taking patterns of the past, there now seems to be a greater tendency for individuals to use a variety of drugs.

Dr. David Smith, in a recent address to the American Psychological Association, has suggested that there has been an increased use of barbiturates in the Haight-Ashbury hippie community. Barbiturates have been used in some European and Asian adolescent drug cultures as the drug of choice but have only been used

to any extent in the Haight-Ashbury as "downers", taken to counteract the effects of a bad psychedelic or amphetamine trip. While the presence of barbiturate addiction has not been noted by most medical workers in the Haight-Ashbury, the increased use of amphetamines in the culture may well be accompanied by the cyclical use of barbiturates, and the resulting addition to these drugs.

Marijuana remains the most frequently used drug in the Haight-Ashbury and enjoys a popularity among all types of drug users. Confiscation of large supplies of this drug by the police in recent months has tended to make it slightly less obtainable and more expensive than in the past. Similarly, shortages in the supplies of LSD and related compounds after the last summer tended to produce the same results, but it is unlikely that a shift to amphetamine use resulted from this alone. Within the past few months, there has been an increase in the availability of LSD and STP which has not visibly affected the predominance of amphetamine use in the Haight-Ashbury.

The most commonly found drugs in the Haight-Ashbury, marijuana, LSD and amphetamines are easily obtained, even by newcomers to the area who have not established any contacts in the neighborhood. Dealers openly call to passers-by on Haight Street, offering a variety of drugs at the current street prices. Conversations with a number of these dealers indicate that the majority of their sales are not, however, made to members of the Haight-Ashbury community itself. Rather, most sales are to outsiders or weekend hippies who do not have other access to drugs. The majority of these street dealers are working independently and often begin with little capital available for the procurement of their wares. Dealing, for them, is a source of small profit, as they have had to pay close to the street price themselves for the drugs they sell. A number of dealers are recognized as large suppliers of drugs and often have considerable financial backing for their enterprise. Such dealers do not typically work the streets but are more often found in the coffee shops and stores of the neighborhood, where they sell directly to the street dealers or to individuals wishing to buy in larger quanti-

ties. While these larger dealers are often drug users themselves, they are rarely members of the Haight-Ashbury community, preferring to live in other areas of San Francisco or in the East Bay, where the chances of police surveillance are thought to be lower.

Unlike the street dealers, who tend to be quite open about their trade, the larger dealers tend to be secretive and often suggest that they are working in some relationship to a drug syndicate. Although the quantity and variety of drugs available through these individuals suggest that they are closer to the illicit source of drugs, there is little evidence to support the oft cited belief in a syndicated or Mafia controlled drug trade. This belief, which is firmly denied by the San Francisco Police Department, is widely accepted by the hippies, who relate many instances of syndicate attempts to control drugs in the Haight-Ashbury. While these beliefs may be based on fact, the large number of independent dealers and the relatively low and competitive prices of drugs in the Haight-Ashbury suggest that a single organization does not control the drug market. It is, however, likely that those individuals or groups who are able to procure drugs in large quantities have been responsible for instances of violence which have supported the beliefs in a syndicate control of the drug market.

According to most informants, the majority of drugs in the Haight-Ashbury originally enter the United States through Mexico and are dispersed to San Francisco through Los Angeles and San Diego. Synthetic drugs, such as LSD and STP, as well as amphetamines, are also made in local underground laboratories, some of which are capable of producing enormous quantities of drugs and are also brought in to the area from similar laboratories, mostly on the East Coast. The drugs available in the Haight-Ashbury are typically produced in an easily recognizable shape or color and information about the quality of a particular drug is quickly disseminated through the culture.

Prior to the winter of 1968, the quality of psychedelic drugs in the Haight-Ashbury was generally considered to be good, much of it coming from a single

local manufacturer. There was talk in the Haight-Ashbury of marijuana and other drugs being adulterated with hard narcotics, amphetamines, or with toxic substances such as strychnine or arsenic, which were reputed to increase the duration of the trip, but such instances were not at all common. The hippies had great confidence in the drugs they procured and there was little fear of being "burned" or cheated in a drug transaction. As the Haight-Ashbury culture began to change, and as certain drugs became more scarce, an increasing number of dangerous drugs, inert compounds and various mixtures of drugs began to be sold on false premises. Mixtures of oregano and bird seed have been sold as marijuana and even aspirin tablets, and Kool-Aid have been represented as LSD. While such misrepresentations as those mentioned are not likely to deceive the experienced drug user, even they began to be suspicious of the drugs being peddled on the streets. The misrepresentation of drugs which was previously confined to dealings with non-hippies became widespread within the hippie culture and the situation today is one of considerable caution and distrust. Almost all of my informants have been "burned" in drug deals and, recognizing that the Haight-Ashbury is no longer a culture based on sharing and love, most of them have come to accept this as an unfortunate but inevitable part of the commercialism of the hippie culture. They have become hardened to the economic pressures of the Haight-Ashbury and many of those who become dealers are forced to employ the same tactics to survive in the marketplace.

While all generalizations about the Haight-Ashbury hippie community are subject to qualification, there is little doubt that the illegal use of drugs has always been the most distinguishing characteristic of the culture. The number of arrests for possession and sale of such drugs has been on the increase since the beginning of 1967, and police action will continue to be a major factor in the survival of the Haight-Ashbury community. Yet, an overview of the drug use habits of the hippie community does not indicate that they have taken any steps to adjust their drug usage to the legal exigencies with which they are often confronted. Most, if not all, members of the hippie community recognize the ille-

gality of their drug use, and recognize the possibility that they might be arrested. Drug dealers are particularly cognizant of this possibility and tend to be somewhat more cautious in disclosing their behavior than the mere consumer of illicit drugs. But, I have not encountered any drug user or dealer in the Haight-Ashbury who has been reluctant to discuss with me their involvement in the drug culture, nor have I found the majority of them willing to adjust their drug use to the prevailing legal statutes.

Until recently, for example, possession of marijuana was considered to be a felony offense while possession of other psychedelic drugs, amphetamines, barbiturates, etc., was treated as a misdemeanor. Despite the severity of the penalties for conviction as a possessor of marijuana, the use of this drug has been flagrantly apparent in the Haight-Ashbury, and has been preferred to other drugs which carried lesser legal penalties. With the recent passage into law of the Biddle measure which allows judges to treat first-time marijuana offenses as either felonies or misdemeanors and which also makes possession of other dangerous drugs potential felony offenses one might expect some shift in the drug use patterns in the Haight-Ashbury. However, this liberalization of the marijuana laws does not seem to have increased the use of this drug in the community nor has the tightening of restrictions on amphetamines produced any decrease in their use. It has always seemed paradoxical that marijuana should be judged more harshly than other psychedelic drugs or than amphetamines, etc., and most hippies have either ignored or challenged this law which they have considered to be archaic and unjust.

It has also been apparent to most members of the Haight-Ashbury community that the police were more concerned with arresting dealers than users of marijuana, and that a large majority of those arrested for mere possession of marijuana were not actually brought to trial. While the District Attorney's office does not acknowledge any special handling of this type of case, claiming that

they will prosecute if a conviction is legally possible, the relatively small number of violators of this law brought to trial suggests that a large majority of arrests were made without honoring the legal rights of the violator, that the quantity of marijuana confiscated was too negligible to provide legal grounds for conviction, or that many offenders were released through leniency on the part of the authorities. Superior Court Judge Joseph Karesh, an advocate of liberalization of the marijuana laws, believes that the courts are being burdened with an excessive number of marijuana cases which most often result in a suspended sentence even when a conviction is brought in. In the light of the controversy surrounding the legal status of marijuana, the difficulties of apprehending users of the drug, the absence of previous criminal records for most marijuana offenders, and the reluctance to bring about a felony conviction or jail sentence in most cases, it seems likely that the use of marijuana is not harshly dealt with by the authorities in most instances and is thus made less dangerous than the legal statutes would suggest. In 1966, for example, over 60% of the individuals arrested for possession of marijuana were released without trial following a preliminary hearing. In a comparable period, the Annual Report of the District Attorney's Office shows that only 46.7% of all suspected felons were released without trial, and only 37% of those arrested for all narcotics violations, including marijuana, were so released. Thus, it seems clear that the policies regarding prosecution for marijuana violations are less stringent than for other offenses. Of those actually brought to trial, only eight convictions (presumably not for first offenders) resulted in prison sentences; four convictions are being appealed, and one individual is listed as being a fugitive from justice.

Although statistical evidence is not yet available to support this view, the increased concern about drug use in the Haight-Ashbury in recent months, the widely accepted belief that a less desirable type of drug user is now prevalent in the Haight-Ashbury, and the increased use of amphetamines in the community

will probably result in a greater number of prosecutions and convictions for violations of the narcotic law than has previously been the case. Among the hippies there is some concern that the new law will allow the courts to discriminate against the lower-class drug user while treating drug offenses by the more privileged hippies as misdemeanors. Such a belief is typical among those who have a strong distrust of the establishment, but according to most of my official informants, there is little likelihood of this occurring in San Francisco.

Runaways to the Haight-Ashbury

The first juvenile runaways to the Haight-Ashbury made their appearance shortly after the mass media announced the beginning of the hippie culture in San Francisco. By the summer of 1967, they accounted for a significant proportion of the hippie population and have come to have a profound effect on the hippie movement here and throughout the country. Runaways are considered by the police to be one of the major problems of the Haight-Ashbury and their presence has probably aroused more public concern and indignation than any other aspect of the hippie culture, including the use of drugs.

Unlike the early theorists of the hippie movement, who were college graduates, students or drop-outs, the runaways were initially attracted more by the carnival atmosphere of the Haight-Ashbury than by any explicit psychedelic philosophy. They have been the consumers of the hippie culture, rather than its architects; yet, it is not unreasonable to assume that their willing participation in the Haight-Ashbury has been one of the most important factors in the development of the hippie movement. Problems of drug abuse, poor housing, immorality and disease, which might have been more easily overlooked if confined to an adult population, took on added significance when seen to affect thousands of inexperienced youths. Parental protests and pleas stimulated much of the official actions taken against the Haight-Ashbury community and newspaper accounts of runaways exposed to the decadence of the hippie scene were calculated to bring about sentiments of adult concern.

While San Francisco has long been a favorite resting place for juvenile runaways, the hippie migration brought these individuals to the city in unprecedented numbers. According to most observers, these runaways differed considerably from the traditional wayward youth, in that they often came from good homes of the upper strata of society, were successful in school, had no prior history of running away or of other delinquency and were welcome to return to parents who promised no reprisals for their disobedience. A number of them came to San

Francisco with adequate amounts of money to live for the summer and a number of them appeared to have either tacit or direct parental approval for their presence here. Others arrived penniless and were unwilling to accept parental support even when it was offered, preferring to live on the streets and partake fully in the hippie way of life.

According to the San Francisco Youth Guidance Center officials, this idealized picture of the runaways was by no means applicable to all their numbers. Mr. Warren Cain, former head of Boy Intake at YGC, claims that even during the summer a majority of the runaways apprehended by the police had prior police records or histories of mental disease and that 70% of them were typical of delinquent youths seen in the juvenile courts. Dr. Seymour Solomon, Chief Psychiatrist at YGC, agrees that not all of the hippie runaways conformed to the picture of the successful and affluent youth but estimates that they comprised a significant majority rather than a small fraction of this group. Police officials, including Captain Quinlan of the Juvenile Bureau, attribute many of the problems with runaways in the Haight-Ashbury to their affluence and their ability to support the culture through financial assistance from parents. The police claim that many youths apprehended have had large amounts of money available to them, often in the form of checks sent to them by their parents, and suggest that much of the crime in the Haight-Ashbury is directed toward separating these youths from their money.

Regardless of their actual proportions in the runaway population to the Haight-Ashbury, it seems clear that the hippie culture has attracted to it not only those youths who seemed destined to become delinquents but also many who might otherwise have followed a more traditional path to maturity. Many writers have speculated on the motives underlying this desertion of respectability and adoption of the hippie way of life (cf, Adler, 1967; Davis, 1967; Earisman, 1968; Kaufman, 1968; Simmons and Winograd, 1966), and their arguments seem most appropriate when applied to the elite runaways rather than their socially and econo-

mically deprived peers. If the hippie culture had been nothing more than a collection of social outcasts and deviants, it is unlikely that it would have gained its present notoriety or have stimulated so much theoretical concern among social scientists.

Although the statistical information available on the number of runaways is inexact, some idea of the magnitude of the runaway problem may be gained from its examination. In considering these data, it should be remembered that police officials estimate that from six to ten runaways in the Haight-Ashbury go uncounted for every one that is noted in the official statistics. Data from the San Francisco Youth Guidance Center and the Juvenile Bureau of the Police Department, which deal only with youths under age 18, indicate a 283% increase from 1966 to 1967 in the number of youths arrested specifically as runaways. This represents an increase from 599 arrests in 1966 to 1,622 arrests in 1967, and does not include those runaways who were apprehended for any other reason. Informal estimates based on the first six months of 1968 suggest that there will be a 150% increase in the number of juveniles arrested as runaways this year, bringing the total number to approximately 2,500. If this figure is multiplied by a factor of six to ten, to include those runaways not apprehended, the current data indicate that at least 20,000 juveniles will arrive in San Francisco this year to participate in the hippie movement. Even this figure is likely to be an underestimate when one adds to it the number of juveniles arrested in the Haight-Ashbury for other reasons, including the use or sale of drugs.

A month-by-month breakdown of these data suggest that the runaways to the Haight-Ashbury are not only a summer phenomenon, although their appearance in the hippie culture seems most pronounced during this period. There has been little talk recently of a summer influx to the Haight-Ashbury which would parallel last year's migrations to the neighborhood, but there is no indication in these data to suggest that such an influx is not occurring. It is possible that the press has recognized their ability to affect the flow of runaways to the Haight-Ashbury

and that they are consciously attempting to prevent such an influx as occurred last summer by minimizing the attention paid to the hippie culture. Another possible explanation for this minimization of publicity given to runaways might lie in the apparent increase in the number of wayward, as opposed to privileged, youths who are arriving this summer and the probably well-founded belief that such youths are of less interest to the public.

The behavior of the young runaways to the Haight-Ashbury is not noticeably different than that of other members of the hippie community, although they tend to be less articulate in expressing their ideological commitment to the culture. It is not difficult for a newcomer to the Haight-Ashbury to become immediately immersed in all aspects of the hippie culture and runaways become wise to the ways of the street within a few days. The importance of this otherwise casual statement is underscored by the fact that the first few days in the Haight-Ashbury are often of decisive significance in determining how a newcomer to the Haight-Ashbury will fare in the culture. A large majority of those runaways who are apprehended by the police, experience adverse drug reactions, or seek counseling or guidance from various agencies, do so within their first week of residence in the neighborhood. First acquaintances in the Haight-Ashbury are also decisive for many runaways in determining their pattern of drug use, their activities on the street and their living accommodations. After a week or more in the culture, the runaway typically comes to know his way around the streets and is often more capable of fending for himself than in the first few days. Runaways may come to panhandle, sell papers, or deal in drugs as a source of income or, particularly in the case of females, will find some sexual partner who will share in their support.

Professional observers of the runaways to the Haight-Ashbury, including psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers, who have dealt with these youths most often, describe them as lonely and frustrated adolescents whose commitment to running away forces them to deny many of the negative attributes of the hippie culture. They tend to focus on the excitement of the culture, their autonomy and

freedom, and on those experiences which are consonant with their expectations of finding in the Haight-Ashbury a community founded on love. Their participation in drug use and sexuality often seems secondary to their conscious search for intimacy and acceptance. Depression seems to be most evident among the runaways who are perhaps most seriously disillusioned by the failure of the hippie culture to gratify their romantic myths. This description is probably more accurate now than it was during the early months of the Haight-Ashbury hippie scene and even now does not serve to describe all of the runaways in the Haight-Ashbury. Included among the runaway population are an increasing number of youths who have found in the Haight-Ashbury a community in which they can express their hostility and find peer acceptance through the acting out of impulses which had caused them to be rejected in other cultures. For them, the Haight-Ashbury is a community in which no questions are asked and in which they can lose themselves in self-gratification and self-aggrandizement. While these may be the wayward youths referred to above and not truly members of the hippie culture, their presence and importance to the community cannot be overlooked, nor can one ignore them in concluding that runaways are universally disillusioned by the Haight-Ashbury.

A large majority of the runaways, like older members of the hippie community, are involved in drug use. Youth Guidance Center officials have estimated that approximately 65% of the runaways apprehended throughout the city use drugs and that this figure is probably higher for those most directly involved with the hippie culture; however, as it is difficult to detect the presence of drugs already ingested at the time of arrest, the YGC records do not accurately reflect the extent of drug use among the runaway population. A further distortion of YGC records in the direction of minimizing the extent of drug use is brought about by the omission of drug use from the official records to avoid prejudicial treatment of these youths by other authorities.

The treatment of runaways by the law enforcement agencies and courts differs greatly from that of adult offenders. A large majority of those arrested (approx-

mately 70%) do not appear before the Juvenile Court, but are returned to their parents or legal guardians without court intervention. If a juvenile is arrested for possession of drugs, he may be brought directly to the YGC or may first be admitted to McCauley Clinic at St. Mary's Hospital for psychiatric treatment or tranquilization. Upon release from the clinic, the runaway might be brought to the YGC for citing or booking, or might be released to custody at the discretion of the Narcotics Squad. In contrast to the common belief that juveniles apprehended as runaways are held at the local precinct station until they can be picked up by their parents (in the case of local runaways), it would seem that this occurs in but a small number of cases. Over 95% of runaways spend at least a few days in custody at YGC and a number of them have spent periods in excess of two weeks at that institution, awaiting disposition of their cases.

Despite the tremendous number of runaways coming to the Haight-Ashbury during the past eighteen months, there is good reason to believe that only a small percentage remain in the neighborhood for an extended period of time. In addition to those runaways who are apprehended by the police, the YGC also deals with a number of self-referred runaways who are seeking assistance in getting back to their families. Other agencies, such as Huckleberry's for Runaways, Off Ramp, the Travelers' Aid Society, and Switchboard, have also been influential in effecting the return of runaways to their parents, while an even larger number of them return home, or at least leave the Haight-Ashbury of their own accord. The number of runaways returned home by these agencies accounts for very few of the total number of runaways in the Haight-Ashbury, but there is some indication that the older residents of the hippie culture have not encouraged the runaways to remain, as they did last summer. As most residents of the neighborhood are willing to admit that the streets are both unpleasant and dangerous for the runaways, there exist today fewer pressures from within the community to bind runaways to the culture. The gradual decline in the availability of free services, food, and housing may also play a part in their more rapid transition through the area than was the case last

summer. Today, the average length of stay for juvenile runaways is probably less than two weeks.

Medical and Psychiatric Problems in the Haight-Ashbury

When officials of the San Francisco Department of Public Health predicted, in the spring of 1967, that the Haight-Ashbury community would be the scene of serious outbreaks of disease, leaders of the hippie community discounted their warning as mere scare propaganda. It was commonly believed that the hippies were of an age that rarely falls prey to physical illness and that acute drug reactions and minor injuries and ailments would be the only real medical problems to be encountered. The diseases anticipated by the Department of Public Health had not actually arisen in the Haight-Ashbury at that time and the predictions had been based on projections of what might happen if a large number of unrelated people began to live in overcrowded and unsanitary conditions. While the hippie leaders asked for official help in preventing such occurrences by providing adequate housing, food, and medical attention, they nonetheless did not expect any serious problems to develop.

Long before the summer influx of hippies began to take place, the Department of Public Health had received complaints from older residents of the Haight-Ashbury about violations of the health code in hippie dwellings. Investigation of these complaints led, in some instances, to the closing down of these residences, but a large-scale inspection of the entire neighborhood by the Department of Public Health at the end of March did not suggest that conditions in the Haight-Ashbury warranted any official intervention. Public Health inspectors selected for examination 690 dwellings in a 23-block area of the Haight-Ashbury and found only 39 instances of violations of the Health code. The majority of these violations (approximately 75%) were not found in hippie residences and only one instance of overcrowding was noted. The remainder of the violations dealt with garbage disposal. Officials of the Department of Public Health considered the number of violations uncovered to be normal for any neighborhood in the city and did not take any further action against the hippie community.

Considering their concern about the possibilities of epidemic outbreaks

CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 1, 1919. Vol. 26, No. 19. Price, Five Cents. Single Copies, 15 Cents. Subscriptions, \$5.00 per Annum in Advance. Foreign, \$6.00. Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized by Act of October 3, 1917. Paid for postage by addressee. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

CONTENTS.—Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

Original Articles: The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191. The Medical Profession and the Public, J. H. T. Moore, M.D., 191.

of disease in the Haight-Ashbury, it is surprising that relatively few preventive measures were taken and that all subsequent inspections in the Haight-Ashbury dealt only with specific complaints. One explanation offered for the failure of the Department of Public Health to take preventive measures was that of the great transiency of the hippie population and the inability of Public Health nurses to maintain contact with hippie residents of the Haight-Ashbury. Hippie spokesmen, however, have suggested that the Department of Public Health was only interested in preventing the emergency of the hippie culture through harassment during the spring of 1967, and that when actual problems began to arise the hippies were left on their own to deal with them.

According to Dr. Deanne Gottfried, Director of the Health Center which deals with the Haight-Ashbury District, the fear of epidemic diseases in the hippie culture was well founded and the failure of such diseases to appear cannot be easily understood. Diseases such as infectious hepatitis, epidemic meningitis, bacterial diarrhea, bacterial pneumonia, tuberculosis and other viral and bacterial infections are likely to develop in places like the Haight-Ashbury where overcrowding and poor habits of personal cleanliness are combined. Yet, with the exception of infectious hepatitis, which has only recently become a serious problem in the Haight-Ashbury, none of these other diseases appears to have developed in the hippie community. Dr. Gottfried suggests that the use of penicillin in the treatment of other medical problems (e.g., colds, strep infections, gonorrhea) may have been effective in controlling the development of these more serious problems. A less likely possibility, but one which certainly applies in isolated cases, is that individuals who became seriously ill while in the Haight-Ashbury returned home for treatment, thus preventing the widespread infection of others in the neighborhood. Public Health officials in Denver, for example, were confronted with 17 cases of infectious hepatitis and feared an epidemic of that disease until they learned that 5 of the cases were of individuals who had recently arrived there from San Francisco.

Health officials in San Francisco are agreed that the potential for serious disease occurrence has existed in the Haight-Ashbury for some time and that future developments are as yet uncertain. While the middle class origins of the original hippies might account for the absence in them of dangerous disease organisms, the changing nature of the hippie population may yet bring into the culture diseases such as tuberculosis and meningitis.

At the present time, there is a widespread occurrence of both infectious and serum hepatitis in the Haight-Ashbury District and throughout San Francisco. Serum hepatitis is assumed to be largely confined to amphetamine users and others who inject drugs directly into their veins but infectious hepatitis is transmitted easily to anyone who comes into contact with food, eating utensils or other materials which have been handled by diseased individuals who fail to take adequate sanitary precautions. Recently, there have also been speculations about a form of toxic hepatitis which may result from the direct action of amphetamines when used in large amounts, but this form of the disease does not appear to be transmittable. Although there is no medical treatment for cases of infectious or other types of hepatitis other than rest, good food, and adequate care, patients have previously been hospitalized for three to four weeks in the isolation ward of San Francisco General Hospital to prevent spreading of the disease. The capacity of this ward (12 beds) and of the second isolation ward established at Laguna Honda Hospital to handle the overflow of hepatitis cases has been exceeded by the rapid spreading of hepatitis through San Francisco and only the most advanced, jaundiced cases are now being hospitalized. One factor responsible for the current proliferation of hepatitis cases in the city is undoubtedly the failure of patients with hepatitis to take the medical advice offered them or to keep in contact with Public Health doctors. Although hepatitis is not uniquely found among the hippies, there is good reason to believe that they are largely responsible for the spread of infectious hepatitis in San Francisco.

Health officials in San Francisco are agreed that the potential for serious disease occurrence has existed in the Haight-Ashbury for some time and that future developments are as yet uncertain. While the middle class origins of the original hippies might account for the absence in them of dangerous disease organisms, the changing nature of the hippie population may yet bring into the culture diseases such as tuberculosis and meningitis.

At the present time, there is a widespread occurrence of both infectious and serum hepatitis in the Haight-Ashbury District and throughout San Francisco. Serum hepatitis is assumed to be largely confined to amphetamine users and others who inject drugs directly into their veins but infectious hepatitis is transmitted easily to anyone who comes into contact with food, eating utensils or other materials which have been handled by diseased individuals who fail to take adequate sanitary precautions. Recently, there have also been speculations about a form of toxic hepatitis which may result from the direct action of amphetamines when used in large amounts, but this form of the disease does not appear to be transmittable. Although there is no medical treatment for cases of infectious or other types of hepatitis other than rest, good food, and adequate care, patients have previously been hospitalized for three to four weeks in the isolation ward of San Francisco General Hospital to prevent spreading of the disease. The capacity of this ward (10 beds) and of the second isolation ward established at Laguna Honda Hospital to handle the overflow of hepatitis cases has been exceeded by the rapid spreading of hepatitis through San Francisco and only the most advanced, jaundiced cases are now being hospitalized. One factor responsible for the current proliferation of hepatitis cases in the city is undoubtedly the failure of patients with hepatitis to take the medical advice offered them or to keep in contact with Public Health doctors. Although hepatitis is not uniquely found among the hippies, there is good reason to believe that they are largely responsible for the spread of infectious hepatitis in San Francisco.

Whereas the Health Center serving the Haight-Ashbury reported approximately 25% to 35% of the hepatitis cases appearing in San Francisco prior to 1968, they are now reporting well over 50% of these cases, suggesting that the hippies are over-represented among the carriers of this disease.

Venereal diseases, notably gonorrhea and vaginitis, are also prevalent in the hippie culture, as well as the rest of San Francisco. The officials of the Department of Public Health have refrained from identifying the group as responsible for the spread of these diseases. The incidence of venereal disease has increased by at least 100% between 1960 and 1964 in San Francisco and has risen steadily since that time with a 35% increase in 1967 from the previous year's total. As venereal disease is known to occur most frequently among young, sexually active individuals, it is not surprising to find a high incidence of V.D. in the hippie population. Doctors who work in the Haight-Ashbury have estimated that perhaps at least half of the girls in the area are infected and that the majority of them are asymptomatic and, thus, unaware that they are spreading V.D. Hippies who go to the V.D. clinic for treatment are often unwilling or unable to identify their sexual partners, and Public Health nurse are typically frustrated in their attempts to locate potential carriers of venereal disease. Some doctors have speculated that the apparently low rate of illegitimate pregnancies among hippie girls may be attributable to sterility produced by untreated venereal infections.

Except for hepatitis and venereal disease, there are few problems of physical health in the Haight-Ashbury that are not in some way associated with the use of drugs. Cases of malnutrition or dietary deficiencies, often brought about by the use of macrobiotic or other special diets, occur with some regularity, as do a variety of minor ailments and injuries typical in an adolescent and young adult population. Some residents of the Haight-Ashbury hippie community are keenly conscious of their physical condition and "body checking" and generally take good care of themselves, seeking medical treatment when it becomes necessary.

Others particularly those who come from less privileged backgrounds, are often unwilling to seek treatment except in emergency situations and are apt to allow themselves to become run down and susceptible to a host of medical problems. One final medical problem which is probably unique to the Haight-Ashbury is that of lacerations of the soles of the feet, which may be the result of a vocational hazard of being "hippies".

While the prolonged use of psychedelic and other drugs may give rise to problems of physical health, the drug-related medical problems of the Haight-Ashbury are primarily those of treating acute toxic drug reactions or "bad trips." Even when such treatment is confined to the use of sedatives or tranquilizers and does not involve any psychiatric intervention, it seems warranted to deal with this issue as a medical problem.

Treatment of "bad trips" produced by psychedelics, especially amphetamines most often consists of some form of chemical sedation, usually chlorpromazine, coupled with the use of formal or informal psychiatric intervention. Used in this sense, psychiatric intervention refers only to the presence of some person who can comfort the patient and "talk him down" from his frightening drug experience and it is only in rare instances that such intervention will be given by a professionally qualified psychiatrist or psychologist. Sedatives, or "downers," are as easily obtained in the Haight-Ashbury as are drugs used to produce a psychedelic experience and it is likely that the majority of "bad trips" are treated without professional help by friends of the patient. Thus, it is difficult to estimate the extent of "bad trips" occurring in the hippie culture or to form any opinions about the drugs which are most likely to give rise to them.

Some indication of the extent of this problem can be gleaned from the number of patients admitted to San Francisco General Hospital who have psychological reactions to various drugs. When one considers that the hippies show a marked aversion to using this facility and that many "bad trips" are treated by friends or at the Free Medical Clinic in the Haight-Ashbury these data

might suggest the actual magnitude of this particular problem. From January through October of 1967, 4,371 patients were admitted to General Hospital for treatment of "bad trips." Included in this number were 1,444 users of LSD and methedrine with the latter drug producing approximately 1% of the adverse reactions. Prior to January of 1967, the number of monthly admissions to San Francisco General Hospital for drug reactions averaged about 100 but by mid-spring had increased to almost 300 monthly admissions. Over the next six months, this figure increased steadily, reaching a peak of 400 admissions in August of 1967, and then began to decline slowly as the hippie population thinned out after the summer. Other acute drug reactions handled by the General Medical Clinic, the LSD Rescue Service, which was in existence through the summer, or informally dealt with by friends or other means, probably bring the daily occurrence of such experiences to between 25 and 50.

The predominance of adverse drug reactions produced by amphetamines noted at General Hospital has now come to characterize the Medical Clinic as well, and has led to a decrease in the psychiatric treatment of these cases, with sedation being the preferred intervention. While some psychedelic users were willing to enter into extended psychotherapeutic treatment following a "bad trip," the amphetamine users, who are on the whole more disturbed, are less likely to seek this form of treatment. Relatively few amphetamine users availed themselves of the outpatient services at General Hospital following their discharge and those that did rarely came for more than two post-discharge visits.

Amphetamine users, treated at San Francisco General Hospital, are typically underweight and in poor physical condition. They tend to be frightened, hyperactive, hostile and show marked paranoid ideation suggestive of a drug-induced psychotic reaction. After the acute drug reaction abates, they appear to be schizoid and are often quite depressed. In contrast to users of psychedelic drugs seen at General Hospital, they are often diagnosed as character disorders with an overlay of psychosis.

Patients who are admitted to General Hospital for acute drug reactions produced by psychedelic drugs are seen as more intelligent, less acutely frightened and panicked, less aggressive, and as more symbolic in their symptomatic behavior. In many cases they are diagnosed to be schizophrenic, but paranoid ideation is not as common as it appears to be among users of amphetamines. Character disorders are also less frequently noted among users of psychedelic drugs.

One special problem which developed toward the end of last summer in the treatment of acute drug reactions should also be mentioned. When the new drug STP or DOM was introduced in the Haight-Ashbury in June, 1967, there was a rash of "bad trips," which seem to have been due to extremely high dosages of the drug which produced trips lasting from two to three days. The chemical composition of the drug was not known at that time and there were numerous speculations about its nature, including that of the local press who suggested that STP was a derivative of a secret nerve gas being developed by the U.S. Army. Through accident or design, there developed a widely spread and believed rumor that STP "bad trips" could not be treated with chlorpromazine. Chlorpromazine was believed to act synergistically with STP, producing respiratory failure and cardiac arrest and a case of death attributable to the combination of these two drugs was reported by the press. Dr. David Smith, Director of the Free Medical Clinic, acting in accordance with these reports, circulated posters warning against the use of chlorpromazine in cases of STP "bad trips" and, as a result, the use of STP in the Haight-Ashbury was greatly curtailed. Sufferers of STP "bad trips" thus went untreated even in acute states of disorganization and panic as did others who did not know, or were unable to state, what drug they had ingested. Dr. Ernest Dernberg, Psychiatric Director of the Free Clinic, publically stated that chlorpromazine could be used in the treatment of STP "bad trips" and he, along with some other physicians, continued this practice with no ill effects. As information concerning the chemical structure of STP became available, and as research demonstrated that STP and chlorpromazine could be safely combined

(Hollister, 1968), fewer cases of STP "bad trips" went untreated, but the myth about the dangers of using chlorpromazine with STP still exist in the Haight-Ashbury, and some physicians are still reluctant to use these drugs in combination. STP was re-introduced in the Haight-Ashbury in recent months in smaller dosages than were previously available and there do not appear to be any serious adverse reactions to this drug at the present time.

Although I have limited this discussion of psychiatric problems in the Haight-Ashbury to adverse drug reactions, it should be recognized that these are by no means the only such problems encountered. However, as few hippies are willing to enter into a psychotherapeutic relationship and as they are generally fearful and suspicious of psychiatric disciplines, there are few opportunities to observe psychiatric problems except in the context of the acute drug reaction. The case descriptions appended to this report and the forthcoming psychological and psychiatric assessments of hippies by the Haight-Ashbury Research Project should throw more light on this area of concern.

Services Available to the Hippie Community

In addition to the various public and private agencies which provide services to residents of San Francisco, there have developed in the Haight-Ashbury a number of unique organizations designed to meet the special needs of the hippie community. Many such organizations have appeared on the scene for a short time only, while a few of them have continued to provide services to the community up to the present. Each of these organizations has been confronted with innumerable difficulties in obtaining funding, finding staff members who are both responsible and compatible with the hippie culture, gaining acceptance in the community, and dealing with other established groups and with local authorities. Internal as well as external problems have caused some of them to close on a temporary or permanent basis, and few of them have continued to provide the same services as those with which they began. While the history of these organizations is an important component in the development and maintenance of the Haight-Ashbury hippie culture, they will be discussed here only in terms of the services they now provide to the hippie community. Passing mention will also be made of some of those organizations no longer in existence.

With few exceptions, the organizations of the Haight-Ashbury either supplement or supplant those offered by various public and private agencies whose services are, at least theoretically, available to the hippie population. In most instances, however, the hippies have avoided establishment agencies except in those situations in which they cannot find resources within their own community. Their rejection of some services available through the establishment has been based on ideological conflicts, but in most cases they have found these agencies hostile to them. The hippies claim that they do not wish to be "hassled" by straight agencies and they often seem to have legitimate grounds for their complaints about such groups. In some agencies they have been faced with direct challenges to their way of life and with demands of conformity as conditions for humane treatment. Although many of these claims are likely to be exag-

gerated by anti-establishment hippies trying to justify their turning away from traditional society, they often do have a good basis in fact. Among the employees and officials of the establishment agencies I have interviewed, there were a number of openly hostile individuals who felt that the hippies were trying to take advantage of the society and who admitted their reluctance to make services available to hippies. There were others who acknowledged sympathy and even admiration for the hippies, but who still justified their refusal to provide them with help on grounds of teaching them about reality or who demanded that the hippies must make some compromises with the establishment to demonstrate the sincerity of their motives.

The rest of this section will be devoted to an overview of some of the services available to the hippies through public and private organizations; mention will be made only of those agencies which have actually been used by the hippies, rather than those who offer services which are either unknown to the hippies or are infrequently used by them.

Among the public agencies which have given assistance to the hippies are the various branches of the Department of Social Services. Hippie applicants over age 21 have been eligible for non-resident public welfare since April of 1960, if they agree to accept any job offered them. Even prior to that date, hippies had applied for and received aid to dependent children (ADC), and aid to families of dependent children (AFDC), even if they were unable to meet the residency requirements necessary for other forms of welfare. Statistics documenting the number of hippies receiving public assistance are not available since these agencies do not categorize their clients, but informal observations of workers in the area suggest that there has not been any wholesale attempt to seek such assistance, although the current hippie population seems to be more willing to accept public money than was the case previously. The age requirement, in any event, makes a large number of hippies ineligible for such funds.

It is now becoming generally known in the hippie community that even non-related individuals living together as a family are eligible for food stamps through a federal program. While a number of hippies in the Haight-Ashbury have availed themselves of this source of public assistance, the difficulties encountered in obtaining stamps, or the necessity of returning each month for additional stamps, has discouraged the great majority of those who need such assistance from taking part in the program.

On the whole the hippies have not taken advantage of the assistance available to them through either state or federal agencies. While this statement may not reflect the utilization of these services by individuals who are seen as hippies by these agencies, it nonetheless appears to be true for those living in the Haight-Ashbury community. At the present time this picture may be changing. A number of my informants, as well as a number of the subjects now being seen at the Haight-Ashbury Research Project, have recently sought public assistance, and the use of these various service agencies by the hippie population may increase in the future.

Medical treatment at San Francisco General Hospital for acute drug reactions has been used to a great extent by the hippies, but the majority of them are quite reluctant to use this facility except in emergency situations or when they are taken there by the police. Although the staff of the drug treatment unit (IMPAC) request that the police drop drug charges against an individual brought to the hospital for emergency treatment, it is commonly believed in the hippie community that the hospital officials inform on their patients. Dr. Arthur Carfagni, Director of the Immediate Psychiatric Aid Center (IMPAC) gives some credence to the hippie reluctance to use the facilities of San Francisco General Hospital, asserting that hippie patients are often harassed by hospital personnel other than those in the psychiatric service. When patients are brought to the hospital after this service closes, and are admitted through regular hospital channels, they are likely to be subjected to numerous questions, verbal abuse, and

in extreme instances, with total neglect or long delays. Even among the psychiatric staff there have been instances of harassment apparently predicated on the resentment built up against hippie drug users who challenge the physician's way of life, even while demanding services from him.

The neighborhood Health Center #2 serving the Haight-Ashbury community, which provides some direct medical services and also provides Public Health nurses for home visits, does not have much appeal for the hippie community except through their programs of prenatal and well-baby care. Referrals to Public Health nurses from the Bureau of Communicable Diseases and from the Department of Social Welfare, which were frequent in the early days of the Haight-Ashbury community, have subsided recently for a variety of reasons. The nurses have been unable to trace hippies suspected of carrying communicable diseases, and, in the case of Social Welfare referrals which were precipitated largely by concern for the welfare of dependent children, they were unable to establish the actuality of the neglectful conditions suspected by the Department. Resources available through these nurses for food, clothing, and adult medical care have not been utilized to any great extent by the hippies. Those medical services which are not available to the hippies through their own community resources, such as free dental or eye care, are also unavailable through the Department of Public Health.

A Public Health nurse who had extensive contact with the hippie community felt that most of the direct services available through the neighborhood Health Center were not needed to any great extent by the hippies and that the majority of the hippies were too proud to accept referrals for additional services such as food and clothing. She claimed that her hippie cases, most of them girls, were more aware of their health needs, and better able to care for themselves than the typical cases seen by the Department of Public Health. She felt that the hippies rejection of Public Health services was based more on distrust of the establishment and the need for autonomy than on lack of concern or lack of health education.

Although the neighborhood Health Center deals with cases of infectious hepatitis, it does not provide any other adult medical care. All cases of venereal diseases are referred to the V.D. Clinic for treatment and for the deployment of Public Health nurses into the field for preventive intervention with potential carriers. As was mentioned previously, few hippies are willing to cooperate with the Public Health doctors or nurses at the V.D. Clinic and a large majority of hippies with known cases of venereal disease either seek treatment through other agencies or fail to return to the V.D. Clinic after a first visit for the periodic treatments and examinations required for adequate control of these diseases.

The Planned Parenthood Association of San Francisco seem to be much less judgmental in their treatment of hippies than is the Department of Public Health, and their services are used to a greater extent by the hippies. Hippies are estimated to comprise at least 20% of the new patients coming for birth control examinations and prescriptions each month. Unlike the public agencies who request considerable information from their patients before services are provided, this group accepts the patient's word about his age and provides care for all, regardless of ability to pay. Most hippie users of this agency are able to pay the monthly fee for a supply of birth control pills, and the majority of them return regularly for this supply. Many referrals are made to Planned Parenthood by the Free Medical Clinic which does not provide this service.

There is some tendency for the more ideologically pure hippies to prefer diaphragms as a method of preventing conception to the use of birth control pills. This preference which is unique to the hippie population appears to be based on their unwillingness to use drugs which distort the body chemistry. While a great number of hippie girls actually come for services, there still exist a large number of them who are not obtaining adequate birth control information and treatment. At least some of these girls appear to believe that the chromosomal damage reputed to occur with LSD use will cause spontaneous abortions if this drug is taken after conception has occurred, and it is likely that a lack of sex education may under-

lie many of the failures to seek the services of this agency.

In passing, it should be mentioned that there has been some discussion among representatives of various public and private agencies, including students at the University of California School of Public Health, of setting up a program of sex education in the Haight-Ashbury. As has been the fate of many such plans by concerned individuals and agencies, no action appears to have been taken to establish such a program. A comprehensive plan for establishing a complete medical service in the Haight-Ashbury community through the Department of Public Health was discussed during the spring of 1967. The failure of this plan to materialize has been attributed by some observers to the reluctance of official agencies to provide services which might contribute to the success of the hippie community. Others, however, feel that this plan was abandoned in anticipation of the protests which might arise from other neighborhood groups, such as the Negro ghetto of the Fillmore District, whose needs for such services are also assumed to be as great as those in the Haight-Ashbury

Other private agencies providing medical and psychiatric treatment which have been used to a greater or lesser extent by members of the hippie community are the Suicide Prevention Center, which during the summer of 1967 worked in conjunction with the Free Medical Clinic and the LSD Rescue Service to provide assistance and referrals to frightened users of psychedelic drugs, and which continues to receive occasional calls from hippies; the medical and psychiatric outpatient clinics of community hospitals, such as the University of California Medical Center and Mt. Zion Hospital, both of which treat a fair number of drug using individuals who may be part of the hippie culture; Children's Hospital, which at one time agreed to take referrals from the Free Medical Clinic, but which has apparently stopped treating juvenile hippie patients due to legal complications; and Synanon, which has apparently accepted a number of amphetamine users to their resident treatment program. Of special interest is the ward at Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute, which under the direction of Dr. Harry Wilmer has been devoted for the

past year to the treatment of drug users from the hippie population, and which has established an excellent liaison with the hippie culture. While the number of patients treated in this ward is not particularly large, this is the only in-patient facility in San Francisco other than that of the General Hospital which focuses entirely on the treatment of drug-induced psychiatric problems.

Private agencies which have provided other than medical services to the hippies include the American Civil Liberties Union, which has represented a number of hippies involved in legal battles; the Salvation Army, which maintains Pinehurst Lodge as a temporary refuge for single women with children, and which has accepted some hippie girls on referral from the Welfare Department; the Traveler's Aid Society of San Francisco, which has assisted hippies, including some runaways, in returning to their homes; and a number of privately supported welfare agencies such as the Jewish Family Service Agency, which assigned a field worker to the Haight-Ashbury both for research and service purposes (Crystal and Gold, 1968), and the Family Service Bureau.

The brief mention given these agencies, and the omission of countless others who have undoubtedly had some contact with the hippie population, is not intended to minimize the importance of these organizations in dealing with the manifold problems of the Haight-Ashbury hippie community. However, the hippies have tended to meet their needs primarily through the resources which have developed in the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood or through the easily accessible though, from their standpoint, less desirable public agencies known to them. The contribution of any other private group, no matter how willing they have been in dealing with those hippies who have come to them for services, cannot be thought of as meeting the needs of the hippie community. As each of these agencies is intended to provide services to the community at large or to some particular group other than the hippies, they have not actively sought to attract hippies to them, nor have they geared their operations to the specific needs and demands of the hippie population. For the most part the hippie population is

unaware of the services available to them through these agencies and only a small minority of hippies are ever likely to avail themselves of these services.

Any discussion of the groups specifically set up to serve in the Haight-Ashbury community must begin with the Diggers, a loosely organized group of Utopian hippies whose activities were as influential in creating the hippie culture as in serving its needs. While the amorphous nature of this group, its intentional eschewal of organization and structure, and its rapidly changing membership make it difficult to adequately trace its history or specify its functions, it seems reasonably clear that the majority of services which characterized the Haight-Ashbury community during the spring and summer of 1967 were either directly or indirectly initiated by members of the Diggers. The identified leaders of the hippie community and the spokesmen for the hippies prior to the summer of 1967, have all been associated with the Diggers and it is quite likely that anyone who provided some important service to the community during this early period automatically joined its ranks.

In any event, the Diggers, who derive their name from a 17th Century English group who took it upon themselves to dig and plan in the public land and distribute their crops to all poor people, began their work in the late fall and early winter of 1966. In the midst of the racial tension in San Francisco following the Hunter's Point riots they began to distribute food in the Panhandle of Golden Gate Park as a symbolic gesture of friendship to the largely Negro community of the Haight-Ashbury district. Perhaps as a result of this experience, and of the community work of some of the early members, the Diggers were among those who planned the Human Be-In in the Park which first attracted attention to the Haight-Ashbury as the gathering place for the hippie movement. The Diggers predicted the influx of hippies to the district in the summer of 1967, and called for the creation of a variety of services to meet the needs of the new community. They argued that they did not require money to establish these services, and they proved that they were able to meet the needs of the

community on their own when the city proved unwilling to provide help or encouragement.

They continued to obtain food from local merchants and distributed a daily meal to more than 150 people in the Panhandle throughout the spring and most of the summer of 1967. They apparently were able to establish their own farms on land donated or lent to them, and began to grow food for subsequent distribution. They maintained a number of communes in the Haight-Ashbury which served as crash pads for newcomers to the district and they were often influential in helping runaways who desired it to be returned to their parents. In keeping with their belief that all services and products should be freely available to those who require them, they opened a Free Store, stocked with used furniture, clothing, kitchenware, and miscellaneous items, all of which could be taken without charge by anyone who wanted it. They initiated the baking of Diggers bread which was also distributed without charge both in the Park and through the Digger headquarters, and they printed recipes for this nutritious bread so that others could make their own. They provided counseling and referral services for a variety of needs, and were ubiquitously useful in meeting all of the needs of the hippie community.

They encouraged a number of the hippie merchants on Haight Street to share their profits with the community and they worked with members of the professional community in San Francisco to establish services to supplement their own work in the neighborhood. The Diggers did not have any apparent source of financial support for their enterprises and they appear to have existed on their ability to get donations of supplies and services from those who were sympathetic to the hippie cause.

Even by the beginning of the summer of 1967, a number of the original Diggers left the Haight-Ashbury, some of them feeling that they could not continue to function without better leadership or organization. Father Leon Harris of All Saints Church in the Haight-Ashbury had cooperated with the Diggers in their

earliest efforts, providing them with the use of the Church's kitchen for preparation of their free meals, and with office space adjoining his Rectory to serve as their headquarters. As the Diggers began to abandon their projects and leave the Haight-Ashbury, Father Harris appointed a committee of Church members to aid the Diggers in their many services. This committee functioned throughout the summer and was then relieved of its responsibility in the fall of 1967, when one of the original Diggers returned to the Haight-Ashbury. During the summer the Digger headquarters which was now called the Community Affairs Office (CAO) added to its list of services to the community a recreation center in the basement of the Church, a pancake breakfast served free on three days during the week, and a Hip Job Co-op, an employment center for hippies which had been independently organized and then transferred to the CAO. Even after the distribution of free food in the Park had stopped the CAO continued to provide up to 1,000 pounds of bread per week to the community in addition to maintaining a number of the original Digger projects.

The CAO has now replaced the Diggers in many of their functions, and a number of the original Diggers have returned to the Haight-Ashbury to organize a commune called the Free City. This group retains many of the original Digger functions such as distribution of food, literature, and information on free things available in San Francisco, but they no longer attempt to serve the entire Haight-Ashbury hippie community. Rather, they restrict their attention to the hippie families or communes in the Haight-Ashbury and the surrounding neighborhoods who they feel have kept up the hippie ideology. The original Diggers work is now available to the hippie community at large only through the CAO. With the help and encouragement of Father Harris, who has been called the Patron Saint of the Haight-Ashbury, many aspects of the Diggers ambitious plans to meet the needs of the Haight-Ashbury community have been preserved, even while the initiators of the plan lost interest in it or failed to maintain their efforts in the face of continually mounting obstacles. Other services in the Haight-Ashbury have had

intimate connections with All Saints Church in their formative stages, and all of them have been able to use the facilities of the Church and the services of the CAO to aid them in their own work in the community. At the present time the CAO remains one of the few Haight-Ashbury services which has had a continuous operation since the spring of 1967, and it is likely to be one of the few service agencies in the neighborhood which will continue to function long after the summer of 1968.

In contrast to the Diggers, whose projects might have died without outside organizational support, the Switchboard, another service initiated from within the Haight-Ashbury community, has continued to function autonomously from the summer of 1967 to the present. Perhaps the greater success of the Switchboard in providing services to the hippie community lies in its less than total involvement with the hippie ideology and in its explicit commitment to provide a link between the hippie and straight worlds. The Switchboard is a volunteer service designed to facilitate communication among people throughout San Francisco, and specifically to serve as an informational and referral source for the Haight-Ashbury community. Al Rinker, Founder and Director of the Switchboard, was an early resident of the Haight-Ashbury hippie community who felt that his organization might best serve the community if it were not identified too closely with the hippie movement. The Switchboard provides a 24-hour-a-day service through which individuals can obtain information about community activities, services, housing, jobs, etc., and leave or receive messages. They maintain a list of runaways whose parents have attempted to contact them, and through posted and newspaper notices circulate the names of individuals for whom messages have been received. Through the summer and fall of 1967 they also acted as the answering service for the Free Medical Clinic.

Al Rinker and his staff are among the most knowledgeable individuals about the Haight-Ashbury community, and a wealth of information pertaining to it can be obtained through the Switchboard. The Switchboard staff has also been

active in discussions of the problems, plans, and prospects of the community, often acting as liaison between the hippies, with whom they share many idealistic goals, and the establishment, with whom they are able to communicate and work toward realistic solutions of community problems. Members of the Police Community Relations Unit and other city officials are in close contact with the Switchboard and appear to take seriously the views of its staff concerning the Haight-Ashbury. In recent months the Switchboard has responded with bulletins and position papers to trouble in the neighborhood and may have been influential in reducing some of the tensions which arose following serious confrontations between the hippies and the police.

A sample of the activities of the Switchboard taken during February and March of 1968, a period of relative inactivity in the Haight-Ashbury, found them receiving between 15 and 20 calls per hour, approximately half of which were for medical assistance or information. Other telephone requests were for information on rock concerts (10%), legal assistance (5%), runaways (5%), jobs (5%), rentals (10%), and a variety of miscellaneous requests and personal calls to staff members (15%). In addition to these telephone requests, 4 or 5 people per hour dropped in to the Switchboard requesting similar information. At periods of greater activity, as in the summer of 1967, the utilization of the Switchboard's facilities was probably 2 to 3 times as great.

The Switchboard also provided lecturers on the Haight-Ashbury community and the hippies to interested groups, and also had a spot on a weekly radio program describing the activities of the community and of their own group. The Switchboard doesn't consider itself to be a Haight-Ashbury organization, and has recently extended itself into other forms of community services. They have established a number of communication centers which put people with similar ideas in touch with each other. The philosophy guiding this most recent innovation, and of the entire organization, is to implement constructive social action by establishing communication among individuals with ideas and with the ability to put

these ideas into action. At various times in the past, they have issued mimeographed informational bulletins or suggestions for community action and have cooperated with other agencies in the distribution of such material. The Switchboard will soon begin publication of a magazine called "It's Happening Now" which is intended to be a manual for the implementation of ideas into action. Members of the community will be encouraged to make suggestions for community action programs which others might be able to develop and bring into reality. Another purpose of the magazine will be to allow individuals and groups to share their experiences in dealing with community problems with others who might be entering into similar ventures. Al Rinker, who is receiving his master's degree in communication psychology at San Francisco State College, believes that the services provided by his organization will not only lead to constructive action as they have in the past, but will also reduce communication barriers which are assumed to underlie much of the dissidence in our society.

In addition to the services conceived of and run primarily by members of the hippie community, the Free Medical Clinic, Huckleberry's for Runaways, Off Ramp, and Happening House, have been of considerable importance in providing services to the Haight-Ashbury hippie community. Each of these agencies was established by professionals of the area in response to their perception of the needs of the hippies, and each of them was able to gain acceptance in the Haight-Ashbury by establishing a working relationship with the hippies themselves.

The Free Medical Clinic was started by Dr. David Smith, its Director, who is a physician and pharmacologist, Dr. Robert Morris, a pathologist, and a number of other professional and non-professional associates. Dr. Ernest Dernberg, a psychiatrist, joined this group shortly after it was formed and became the Psychiatric Director of the Clinic. The idea for the Free Medical Clinic was apparently initiated by the public discussions about the anticipated influx of hippies to San Francisco which were held in the spring of 1967. Despite the concerns expressed by officials of the Department of Public Health about

the medical problems which might originate in the Haight-Ashbury, it seemed obvious to most observers that no official actions would be taken to provide special medical care for the hippies. Thus, Dr. Smith and his associates formed a group which organized the Free Medical Clinic in the Haight-Ashbury, and through newspaper and other media attempted to find community support for this enterprise.

The original intent of the Free Medical Clinic was to provide all medical services to the hippie community through the use of volunteer physicians, contributed drugs and equipment, and a small paid staff of nurses and clerks whose salaries, as well as other operating expenses, would be paid through donated funds. During their first few weeks of operation most of their work dealt with relatively minor medical problems such as injuries, abscesses, infections, sore throats, and some adverse drug reactions. No cases of venereal disease, hepatitis, or the other diseases anticipated were treated at the beginning of the summer of 1967. As the Clinic became known in the Haight-Ashbury, an increased number of adverse drug reactions began to appear, and a number of hippies began to come in simply to talk with someone about their problems. Psychiatrists and psychologists joined the volunteer physicians to deal with these patients, and the Clinic expanded its physical plant from its original six-room office to include the adjoining suite of rooms, which was largely given over to psychiatric care.

A Calm Center was established in a large room of the Free Medical Clinic as a place where people on bad trips could sit and be "talked down" or where they could meditate and relax. It was originally run by hippie volunteers who attempted to make it into a Zen-Astrology center but was later stripped of its mystical trappings and set up under medical control as a facility for the treatment of bad trips. As the summer progressed the number of bad trips increased to 30 to 40 per day, and a large part of the Clinic's operation was devoted to the treatment of drug related problems.

Some more serious medical problems began to appear toward the end of the summer, and the Free Medical Clinic found it necessary to refer an increasing

number of patients to other facilities, including those of the Department of Public Health, for other than emergency care. Girls were referred to Planned Parenthood for contraceptive information and examinations, cases of venereal disease were referred to the V.D. Clinic run by the Department of Public Health, and hepatitis cases were referred to San Francisco General Hospital. Due to the legal problems involved in the medical treatment of juveniles on other than an emergency basis, the Free Medical Clinic attempted to find other sources of medical treatment for them. In the majority of cases the Free Medical Clinic was forced to provide treatment for juveniles themselves, and, in the light of the legal restrictions placed on the provision of services to juveniles, were apparently fortunate in avoiding charges being brought against them.

As the number of adverse drug reactions and other essentially psychiatric problems brought to the Clinic increased through the summer and fall of 1967, a number of psychiatrists and psychologists introduced a variety of different treatment techniques to the Free Medical Clinic. Psychotherapeutic techniques such as psychodrama, encounter groups, group psychotherapy, and Gestalt therapy were introduced to supplement the traditional face-to-face psychotherapy practiced at the Clinic, and many of these seemed to be more easily accepted by the hippies than was the traditional form of treatment. However, according to Dr. Dernberg, the similarity of these novel techniques to the already existing hippie mystique, and their failure to provide the hippies with a close personal relationship with a therapist, made them unsuitable to deal with the basic problems underlying many of the psychiatric problems presented. While many of the patients treated by the psychiatric staff of the Free Medical Clinic came in only during acute drug reactions which required sedation and immediate intervention, a number of them returned for regularly scheduled psychotherapy which Dr. Dernberg feels can best be handled in individual therapy sessions.

Throughout the summer of 1967 the Free Medical Clinic was open on a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week basis, and provided treatment to over 10,000 people seen

at a rate of 100 to 150 per day. Professional services were donated by some thirty physicians, psychiatrists, and psychologists who worked with a group of over forty volunteer nurses, medical helpers, clerks, and other assistants, reducing the operating costs of the Clinic to approximately one dollar per patient, or an estimated yearly budget of \$50,000. During the summer, when the response of the straight community to the hippies was more or less positive, these operating costs were met by individual donors, including a number of prominent Bay Area personalities, Haight-Ashbury entrepreneurs, and even some of the drug dealers of the community, and by the income from the benefit concerts held for the Free Medical Clinic by local and nationally known rock groups and entertainers. Nonetheless, the Clinic was forced to close temporarily at the end of September, 1967, due to a lack of funds and the extreme burden placed on the volunteer staff. Dr. Morris, one of the Clinic founders, stated at that time that the Clinic would not reopen unless they could be guaranteed sufficient funds for a full year's operations, but in response to community support and encouragement, the Clinic reopened after a few weeks even though their financial support would still have to be met on a month-to-month basis. Applications had been made to a number of federal and state agencies for financial aid, but these agencies seemed unwilling to provide funds to support the Free Medical Clinic's services to the hippie community. Federal support was given the Clinic by the National Institute of Mental Health and by the Food and Drug Administration to support a number of their research activities, but these funds could not be used to provide direct medical services. The official attitude of these government agencies toward the Free Medical Clinic have also been applied in the evaluation of other grant applications made to work in the Haight-Ashbury hippie community. In most instances funds were made available for research but not for service projects.

When the Free Medical Clinic reopened in October, 1967, they reduced their operating hours to between 2:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., on a six-day-a-week basis, and arranged a 24-hour-a-day-telephone answering service through the Switchboard.

They continued to deal with a large number of patients, reaching to between 80 and 100 per day by the spring and summer of 1968, but were apparently forced to refer a large number of them to other treatment facilities for other than emergency or minor care.

By the fall of 1967 the number of acute reactions to psychedelic drugs had begun to decrease, and the psychiatric staff of the Free Medical Clinic was dealing with more long-term psychological problems in continuing psychotherapeutic relationships. The increased use of amphetamines was also becoming apparent by this time, and the staff of the Clinic found the treatment of speed users to be considerably more difficult than that of the psychedelic users. Psychiatric intervention with amphetamine users was less typically employed due to the hostility and paranoia of those who came to the Clinic for treatment, and sedation was the only treatment in the majority of cases. By the summer of 1968, the number of psychedelic bad trips seen at the Clinic had dropped to only two or three per week, while Dr. Dernberg estimated that there had been a four to five hundred percent increase in the number of amphetamine users in the Haight-Ashbury.

At the present time the problem of amphetamine use is being studied by the Amphetamine Research Project through a grant made by the National Institute of Mental Health to Dr. David Smith and Dr. Fred Meyers, a University of California pharmacologist. This project is being directed by Roger Smith, a criminologist, who is working with the Free Medical Clinic staff to develop de-toxification techniques for the treatment of amphetamine users as well as to understand the reasons underlying the use of this drug. Dr. Dernberg has separated the psychiatric service from the Free Medical Clinic and now operates a psychiatric clinic with its own staff of twenty volunteer psychiatrists, psychologists, and student trainees. The separation of the Amphetamine Research Project and the psychiatric services from the Free Medical Clinic may be in anticipation of the closing of the Clinic in the near future. At the present time the Free Medical Clinic

is closed following the failure of a series of benefit concerts held over the Labor Day weekend to provide sufficient funds for its continued operation, but it is as yet uncertain whether this is a temporary or permanent closing.

Even if the Free Medical Clinic is forced to close, these related research and service functions will continue to provide medical and psychiatric care to the Haight-Ashbury community. It is also likely that Dr. Smith and his associates will continue to play a major role in the dissemination of information about the nature and effects of psychedelic and other drugs to the community. The Journal of Psychedelic Drugs, founded and edited by Dr. Smith, will probably continue its publication of articles on drug use and abuse, and there is some speculation that Dr. Smith may be involved in the organization of a Free Medical Clinic in Berkeley, which is now thought to be a likely successor to the Haight-Ashbury as a center of the drug based youth culture. It is also possible that Dr. Smith may write a book based on his experiences with the Free Medical Clinic which is likely to be a significant addition to the literature on the Haight-Ashbury hippie community.

Huckleberry's for Runaways was organized at about the same time as the Free Medical Clinic and has provided continuous services to the Haight-Ashbury hippie community since that time, with the exception of a brief closing in the winter of 1967. Huckleberry's was organized through the cooperative efforts of many private agencies and individuals who formed an ad hoc committee in the spring of 1967 to discuss the needs of the hippies anticipated to arrive in the Haight-Ashbury in great numbers during the summer. Although the Diggers were providing some housing and other services to runaways at this time, this group of professionals felt that they could both add to these services and make them acceptable to the establishment which had already threatened to interfere with the Diggers' activities.

Huckleberry's is sponsored by the Regional Young Adult Project, a coordinating and incorporated agency of several church groups including Glide Foundation,

the United Church of Christ, the Methodist Church, and the San Francisco Council of Churches. The initial funding was met by some of these groups in conjunction with the San Francisco Foundation, who also provided a \$5,000 grant to extend the operation of Huckleberry's through the summer of 1968. All other funding required to meet the monthly operating budget of approximately \$2,000 has been met by donations from private individuals.

The Reverend E. Larry Beggs, and Mrs. Barbara Brachman, were appointed by the Glide Foundation as co-directors of Huckleberry's, and an advisory committee composed of professional workers, students, and members of the hippie community was formed to deal with policy decisions. Over a hundred professional and non-professional workers have joined the staff of Huckleberry's in the past year, and after an orientation meeting and individual screening by members of the advisory committee, they have been assigned to serve a variety of functions. Most professional workers, including psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers, are available on call to provide counselling, therapy, or diagnostic evaluations to runaways and their parents, while the non-professional staff provides the on-going management of the house and clerical services, and functions as liaison with the street. A permanent staff of eight assistant directors, two house managers, who supervise the care of runaways living at Huckleberry's, and a managing director are responsible for the operation of this agency and for the coordination of the volunteer staff. Only the house managers and the managing director are salaried, as is the current Director, Reverend Beggs.

Huckleberry's for Runaways provides a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week counselling, housing, and referral agency for runaways to the Haight-Ashbury. Since their opening they have provided direct services to over 750 runaways, many of whom have spent from a few nights to a month in residence at their house. A large majority of the runaways who come to Huckleberry's have been in the Haight-Ashbury for less than a week, and perhaps half of them have been there

for no more than a day or two. Recently, a number of youngsters have contacted Huckleberry's before running away to tell them that they were planning to arrive and that they would be in need of Huckleberry's services. In the light of these data it is not surprising that Huckleberry's has been instrumental in returning approximately 65% of their teenage clients to their parents. Huckleberry's has also been contacted by the parents of over 1,000 other runaways who sought assistance in establishing contact with their children. Although Huckleberry's policy is to deal only with those runaways who directly seek their services, they have maintained a message file and a runaway bulletin board, and have also had workers out on the streets of the Haight-Ashbury whose function has been to offer assistance to youngsters who seemed to be in need of help, and to describe the services available through Huckleberry's to those who might someday require their help.

Runaways who come to Huckleberry's are offered counselling and referral services regardless of their willingness to return to their parents or to notify them of their whereabouts. Those who wish to be housed at Huckleberry's are required to phone their parents for permission to stay at the house, and the parents are then sent a written form to confirm this permission. In many cases this phone call results not only in parental permission to stay at Huckleberry's, but also begins the process by which children are brought into contact with their parents and a return home arranged. Parents have come to Huckleberry's from all over the country to meet with their child and with a professional volunteer who conducts a family session designed to clarify and perhaps resolve some of the conflicts which led to the child's running away. Approximately one-third of the Bay Area runaways seen at Huckleberry's have met with their parents in such a family session, and Huckleberry's has arranged for similar counselling services for families from other communities. A program called Families in Conflict has recently been established to bring groups of parents together with professionals for discussion of problems encountered with teenagers and to

familiarize them with the particular problems of youngsters involved in the hippie scene. In addition to these services, Huckleberry's also arranges for legal counselling for runaways through the Neighborhood Legal Assistance Foundation, and also works in conjunction with the Juvenile Courts and Probation Departments throughout the country who have legal jurisdiction over some of the runaways seen at Huckleberry's.

Although they have attempted to work with parents and with the establishment in the handling of runaways, until recently Huckleberry's has been plagued by considerable opposition from local officials. They have been denied a license required for the housing or treatment of juveniles, have been raided by the police who arrested their co-directors for illegally harboring runaway juveniles, have had juveniles taken from them and sent to the Youth Guidance Center even when these runaways had obtained parental permission to stay there, and have often been harassed by police officials who have denied the legitimacy of their activities in the Haight-Ashbury. While such incidents characterized the official relationship between Huckleberry's and the San Francisco establishment, particularly the Juvenile Court and the Juvenile Bureau of the Police Department, there has existed throughout their operation a friendly and cooperative relationship with many individuals and agencies within the establishment. Huckleberry's has worked cooperatively with the Missing Persons Bureau, and with the Park Police district station, both of which apparently were aware of Huckleberry's ability to deal with the runaway problem in areas where official agencies were more or less ineffective. Parents who came to the police in search of runaway children were often told to contact Huckleberry's even though the official police attitude toward Huckleberry's was one of hostility. Recently, however, the relationship between Huckleberry's and the establishment has improved to a great extent, and there is good reason to assume that their operations will no longer be opposed by official agencies. Police Chief Cahill and Mayor Alioto have both openly endorsed the activities of Huckleberry's, and police throughout the city

have been asked to contact Huckleberry's if a runaway is one of their clients. A license to house juveniles has just been granted, and if additional funding becomes available, Huckleberry's will probably expand its housing services to runaways in the near future.

Huckleberry's is scheduled to move from its present location at the end of September 1968. Due to a lack of funds, it will be necessary for them to close temporarily at this time, and until the recent granting of their license changed their prospects for the future, it seemed unlikely that they would reopen at all. They have been offered office space through the Family Service Bureau and may form a liaison with Hospitality House, Traveler's Aid Society, and other agencies to provide a broader range of services to juveniles throughout the Bay Area. Huckleberry's is now preparing a grant application to be submitted to the Rosenberg Foundation and the San Francisco Foundation in November 1968, and their future activities will rest on their ability to secure financial backing. A book describing the work at Huckleberry's has been written by Reverend Beggs, and is scheduled for publication in January 1969.

Happening House, whose existence in the Haight-Ashbury was relatively short-lived, was established to bring a variety of educational services to the hippie community. This service was conceived of by Professor Leonard Wolf of San Francisco State College and was funded by the San Francisco Foundation. Happening House was open through the summer and fall of 1967, and offered an opportunity for all interested individuals, hippies or straights, to teach or attend classes in many different subjects ranging from crafts to mysticism to music. A sampling of courses listed in their informal "catalog" includes: tie-die and Batik workshop; Hatha Yoga meditation; beginning arts and crafts (basketry, sculpture, masks, totems, puppets, etc.); Yoga, poetry art; recorder; creative writing; adventures in consciousness; candle-making workshop, and head trips (delvings into modern-day psychology).

In addition to these regularly scheduled classes, the Hippies and many of their leaders used Happening House as a gathering place where many discussions, meetings, and spontaneously created activities took place. The large, gaily painted and decorated Victorian house was set up to provide facilities for all sorts of educational and recreational activities, and was generally regarded as one of the focal points of the hippie culture.

Although the majority of those who came to Happening House were respectful of its rules, including not using drugs on the premises, a series of unfortunate incidents led to its closing during the winter of 1967. Professor Wolf was arrested during a dance sponsored by Happening House at which a number of dancers took off their clothes, and, despite his success in defending his innocence in this matter, Happening House closed and was not reopened. Plans to reopen Happening House as a branch of the San Francisco State Experimental College did not materialize, and the house itself now serves as the headquarters for three projects, only one of which, an Ecumenical Ministry in the Haight-Ashbury run by Father Lyle Grosjean, bears any similarity to the Happening House program. The building now houses the Amphetamine Research Project and the Psychiatric Service of the Free Medical Clinic.

The Off Ramp is the oldest service agency in the Haight-Ashbury hippie community and is perhaps less known than any of those previously discussed. Organized by Mr. Howard Rochford in the early winter of 1966 in anticipation of the growing hippie scene, this service has been in continuous operation since that time. Off Ramp is open every evening in the basement of the Hamilton Methodist Church and offers counselling, referrals, and a coffeeshop to members of the hippie community. In certain circumstances housing can also be arranged through Off Ramp, but no housing is available on the premises.

Mr. Rochford is a social worker who perceived the need for these services before there was any general awareness that the Haight-Ashbury would become the center of the hippie scene. With the cooperation of the congregation of the

Church and the help of the leaders of the hippie community he organized a Christmas dinner for the hippies in 1966 and, with funds provided entirely through donations, has established an agency to serve the hippies on a regular basis. The Off Ramp is staffed by volunteers who are available to talk with the hippies and to offer them assistance if they should request it. Professional consultants are used to help the staff in their work, but do not provide any direct services except in emergency situations. The physical layout of Off Ramp is carefully controlled by Mr. Rochford, whose experiences have led him to choose a structure which he feels is most effective in keeping order while providing an atmosphere conducive to talk and relaxation. Refreshments are available without charge.

The Off Ramp serves from 30 to 100 hippies each night, many of whom are regulars who seem to use Off Ramp as a place to find a temporary refuge from the streets. No attempt is made to offer counselling or other assistance to those who come in, but the staff is available to provide such help if it should be requested. Staff meetings are held each night to discuss the problems in dealing with specific individuals and to clarify some of the techniques which might be used to facilitate services.

The Off Ramp provides services which overlap considerably with those of other Haight-Ashbury agencies and will probably come to play a larger role in the community with the closing of the Free Medical Clinic and Huckleberry's.

Other services now available to the hippie community include low-cost meals provided by the Messiah's World Commune, the Hearth Coffeehouse at the Howard Presbyterian Church, and at the Livingroom, all of which also provide religious counselling: and draft counselling at the Hearth Coffeehouse and at the F. D. Maurice House, run by the Episcopal Peace Fellowship. These religiously oriented services are not used to any great extent by the hippies except as sources of cheap meals or specific counselling, and the intended function of some of these agencies to establish a liaison between the hippies and the straight world is most often frustrated.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. Campus drug culture, Per/Se, Fall, 1966
- Adler, N. The Antinomian Personality: A Typological Construct. Unpublished Manuscript, 1967.
- Crystal, D. & Gold, I. A Social Worker in Hippie-Land. Unpublished Manuscript, 1968.
- Davis, F. Why all of us may be hippies someday. Trans-action, V, 2, 1967.
- Earrisman, D.L. Hippies In Our Midst. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Freedman, M. Some Facts About the College Drug Scene. Unpublished Manuscript, 1967.
- Hollister, L.E. Chemical Psychoses. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.
- Kaufman, J. Runaways, Hippies and Marijuana. Unpublished Manuscript, 1968,
- Rigney, F. & Smith, L. The Real Bohemia. New York: Basic Books, 1961.
- Simmons, J. & Winograd, B. It's Happening. Santa Barbara: Marc-Laird, 1966.
- Soskin, W. & Korchin, S. Therapeutic Explorations With Adolescent Drug Users. Unpublished Grant Application, 1967.
- Wolf, L. (Ed.) Voices From the Love Generation. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968.

the first of the two main parts of the book.

The first part of the book is devoted to the study of the

history of the book, and the second part to the study of the

history of the book, and the second part to the study of the

history of the book, and the second part to the study of the

history of the book, and the second part to the study of the

history of the book, and the second part to the study of the

history of the book, and the second part to the study of the

history of the book, and the second part to the study of the

history of the book, and the second part to the study of the

history of the book, and the second part to the study of the

Selected Annotated Bibliography

I. The Hippies and the Haight-Ashbury

Adler, N. The antinomian personality: A typological construct. Unpublished manuscript, 1967.

This paper, which is not yet available in published form, may be obtained through the Haight-Ashbury Research Project or directly from its author. Hippies are seen as representative of other Utopian and heretical groups which have arisen throughout history in periods of social disorganization. Unable to find meaning or a sense of identity in their environment, the antinomian seeks a "...return to the wonder and innocence of childhood." The hippie ethos and the use of psychedelic drugs are motivated by the attempt to find psychological stability within the person, while rejecting identification with the external world. Unlike other treatments of this theme, which focus primarily on historical antecedents of the hippie cult, this paper is rich in psychological description and analysis and should be the source of many fruitful hypotheses about the hippie personality.

Bronsteen, Ruth. The Hippies Handbook. New York: Canyon, 1967.

This pamphlet is primarily a glossary of hippie terminology and a compendium of information designed to orient the newcomer to the Haight-Ashbury and the East Village. It contains an interesting reprint from the Los Angeles Free Press on "How to Survive on the Streets", and also brief discussions of drug effects, avoiding the police and other facets of life in the hippie culture. It is probably read more by adults wishing to learn about the hippies than by those entering the scene.

THE
JOURNAL OF THE
ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

Vol. 100, Part 1, 1970

CONTENTS

1. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
2. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
3. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
4. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
5. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
6. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
7. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
8. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
9. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
10. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)

THE JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

11. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
12. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
13. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
14. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
15. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
16. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
17. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
18. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
19. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)
20. *The evolution of man: a review of the evidence* (J. Huxley)

Brown, J.D. (Ed.) The Hippies. New York: Time, Inc., 1967.

A collection of articles by correspondents of Time, this book provides the reader with an excellent overview of the hippie scene throughout the United States and some foreign cities as it existed in 1967. The individual chapters are well researched and descriptive material is interestingly combined with sociological and psychological speculation. The book conveys the spirit of excitement which characterized the early days of the hippie movement but does not either condone or condemn the hippies. This is perhaps the best introduction to the hippie scene available in the literature.

The Digger papers. San Francisco, 1968.

This collection of articles expressing the ideology of the Diggers or Free City People of San Francisco has been distributed widely throughout the Bay Area and has been reprinted in its entirety in a recent issue of the Realist. Its content represents a curious admixture of hippie and New Left positions on the role of the individual in society and the theme of individual freedom and communal sharing predominate. Little attention is given to the role of psychedelic drugs in this collection and the reader can sense more anger and militancy here than one might have expected from knowledge about the Diggers in the early days of the Haight-Ashbury community. Written in the spring of 1968, this collection expresses nicely the ideological changes that have occurred in the most Utopian theorists of the hippie movement.

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

Earisman, D. L. Hippies in our Midst. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

This book, by a Professor of English at Upsala College in New Jersey, is a thoughtful attempt to understand the hippies and to place their activities into an historical context. The author, who restricts his observations to the hippie scene in the East Village, is openly biased in favor of the hippies, but is deeply concerned about their individual and collective fate. Although there is some tendency to romanticize the hippie movement and to project profound meaning into all aspects of their ideology and behavior, the book raises many interesting questions and does not reach any premature conclusions.

Feldman, G. & Gartenberg, M. The Beat Generation and The Angry Young Men. New York: Citadel, 1958.

This collection of writings from the Beat Generation provides an interesting basis for comparison with the hippies. The introductory discussion of the Beats by the editors presents many of the themes which are used to account for the development of the hippie movement and should be of particular interest to readers with a sociological orientation. The individually contributed writings which make up the remainder of the volume also contain much information relevant to an understanding of the origins of the hippie scene in San Francisco.

Gross, H. The Flower People. New York: Ballantine Books, 1968.

This paperback volume consists of a series of interviews with hippies in the East Village. The interviews are presented in an edited, narrative form, but all of the dialogue comes directly from the interviewees. There does not appear

to be any particular basis in the selection of material for inclusion and the interviews seem to represent a fair cross-section of a hippie population. Ideological statements are made less articulately here than in Leonard Wolf's comparable collection of interviews with leaders of the Haight-Ashbury hippie community, but the value of this book lies in its focus on the typical rather than the elite hippie.

von Hoffman, N. We Are the Children Our Parents Warned Us About. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1968.

The author of this book spent a good deal of time in the Haight-Ashbury during the summer of 1967, and has written a loosely organized pastiche of his experiences here. The book is less judgmental than his newspaper articles of last summer and derives its greatest value from the richness of the author's description of the hippie scene and its early development. The book should be of special interest to those readers who are concerned with the contributions of specific individuals in shaping the Haight-Ashbury community; it should be a good companion piece to Leonard Wolf's collection of interviews with many of these people.

Rigney, F. J., & Smith, L.D. The Real Bohemia. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1961.

This is a report of a psychological and psychiatric study of members of the Beat Generation in San Francisco's North Beach area. Projective and objective personality tests were used in combination with psychiatric interviews to describe the personality characteristics of the Beats. While results of this study are somewhat ambiguous and few generalizations are offered, the data contained in the report should prove useful in comparison with the data now being collected by the Haight-Ashbury Research Project.

Simmons, J. L., & Winograd, B. It's Happening. Santa Barbara: Marc-Laïrd, 1966.

This book, which first appeared in 1966, is an attempt to describe and explain to the adult reader the many facets of the contemporary youth scene. Chapters dealing with sex, politics, education, drugs, music, and other aspects of youth culture contain both descriptive material and interpretive discussions which lean heavily on sociological analysis. Although this book was written prior to the formal emergence of the hippie culture, it provides some excellent insights into the immediate antecedents of the hippie ideology and life style. The authors' explanatory pronouncements are often too glib, but they provide the reader with a number of conceptual frameworks for an understanding of the hippies.

Wolf, L. (Ed.) Voices From the Love Generation. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1968.

This collection of interviews with the leaders and luminaries of the Haight-Ashbury hippie community places emphasis on both the philosophy of the hippie culture and on the personal experiences of those who brought this philosophy to the Haight-Ashbury. The interviews are preceded by an excellent introduction by the editor which contains many valuable insights into the development of the hippie scene in San Francisco. The interviews are well done and contain many articulate statements of the hippie ideology and of the personal histories of those who came to espouse it; however, it should be remembered that these theorists of the hippie movement are not typical of the hippie population at large.

Wolfe, B. H. The Hippies. New York: The New American Press, 1968.

This paperback discussion of the hippie scene in the Haight-Ashbury bears considerable similarity to the von Hoffman book. It is rich in journalistic description of the Haight-Ashbury during the summer of 1967, and provides the reader with a wealth of detail about the daily activities of the hippies. It offers little more than description, however, and tends toward sensationalism which suggests a thinly veiled moralistic attitude.

II. Psychedelic Drugs

Andrews, G., & Vinkenoog, S. (Eds.) The Book of Grass. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

This anthology of literature dealing with marijuana contains, in addition to scientific papers, a number of literary and religious references. Intended primarily for the non-technical reader, this book should serve as an excellent introduction to the historical significance of marijuana. There is some tendency to omit papers critical of marijuana use, but the relative infrequency of such papers in the literature does not make this a particularly biased collection. Of particular interest is the brief selection from the report of the Hemp Drugs Commission of the British Army in 1394, which is one of the classic studies of marijuana use prior to recent times.

Blum, R., & Associates. Utopiates. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.

This report of an epidemiological study of LSD users compares the psychological and sociological characteristics of individuals who used LSD for various reasons prior to the advent of the psychedelic movement. It's authors are among the most knowledgeable researchers in this field, and their discussion of the effects of LSD and the significance of psychedelic drugs in our society make interesting and valuable reading. The subjects of this study, however, do not bear much resemblance to the hippie users of LSD.

DeBold, R.C., and Leaf, R. C. (Eds.) LSD, Man and Society. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1967.

The papers collected in this volume were presented at a public symposium on LSD held at Wesleyan University in March, 1967. The quality of all of the papers is excellent and the transcripts of the discussions following their presentation adds considerably to the value of the book. The range of topics covered

includes the chemical structure and neurological and behavioral effects of LSD, the motives underlying the use of LSD, the therapeutic uses of LSD, and problems of LSD abuse, and social and legal problems associated with the use and regulation of LSD. While these are the familiar topics surveyed in other collections of papers in the literature, the information and opinions offered here are of particular interest as being more current and less biased than other treatments of these topics.

Hollister, L. E. Chemical Psychoses. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.

This monographic length review of the literature on LSD and related drugs is intended for use by physicians and other professionals. It was prepared by a leading researcher of the psychopharmacological aspects of these drugs and is the best single source of information in the literature. It contains information on the chemical structure, psychological effects and therapeutic uses of psychedelic compounds as well as a review of major theories of the mechanisms of drug effects.

Huxley, A. The Doors of Perception and Heaven and Hell. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

This classic volume in the literature on psychedelic drugs contains one of the most articulate and eloquent descriptions of the psychedelic experience. Huxley is regarded as one of the prophets of the psychedelic movement and many of its philosophical, religious, and mystical principles are adumbrated in this volume. This book is a pleasant and readable introduction to many facets of the current psychedelic culture.

Louria, D. B. The Drug Scene. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

This recent addition to the popular drug literature is a readable account of the drug scene in various American and European cities. It is less judgmental than the author's previous volume, The Nightmare Drugs, but does not make any real contribution to an understanding of the drug user or of the effects of drugs upon him. Its value lies in its descriptions rather than its discussions.

Masters, R. E. L., & Houston, J. The Varieties of Psychedelic Experience. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1966.

This book, subtitled, "The First Comprehensive Guide to the Effects of LSD on Human Personality", is of interest only for its many descriptions and verbatim reports of the psychedelic experience. Its authors are advocates of the psychedelic movement and they are often uncritically accepting of the dogma of the drug cult.

Metzner, R. (Ed.) The Ecstatic Adventure. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1968.

This most recent contribution to the psychedelic literature contains a series of descriptions of the psychedelic experience written by individuals with many different backgrounds and frames of reference. Although the editor has clearly biased his selection in favor of psychedelic drugs, the descriptions are well worth reading. Of particular interest is the comparison of the drug experiences resulting from a variety of psychedelic agents.

Solomon, D. (Ed.) LSD--The Consciousness-Expanding Drug. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1964.

This edited collection of scientific articles on LSD and other psychedelic drugs contains the opinions of many of the notable investigators in this area of research. While the editor and a number of the authors represented are

The first part of the report is devoted to a description of the work done during the year. It is divided into two main sections, the first of which deals with the work done in the laboratory and the second with the work done in the field. The first section is divided into three parts, the first of which deals with the work done in the laboratory and the second with the work done in the field. The second section is divided into two parts, the first of which deals with the work done in the laboratory and the second with the work done in the field.

The second part of the report is devoted to a description of the results of the work done during the year. It is divided into two main sections, the first of which deals with the results of the work done in the laboratory and the second with the results of the work done in the field. The first section is divided into three parts, the first of which deals with the results of the work done in the laboratory and the second with the results of the work done in the field. The second section is divided into two parts, the first of which deals with the results of the work done in the laboratory and the second with the results of the work done in the field.

The third part of the report is devoted to a description of the conclusions drawn from the work done during the year. It is divided into two main sections, the first of which deals with the conclusions drawn from the work done in the laboratory and the second with the conclusions drawn from the work done in the field. The first section is divided into three parts, the first of which deals with the conclusions drawn from the work done in the laboratory and the second with the conclusions drawn from the work done in the field. The second section is divided into two parts, the first of which deals with the conclusions drawn from the work done in the laboratory and the second with the conclusions drawn from the work done in the field.

The fourth part of the report is devoted to a description of the recommendations made by the committee. It is divided into two main sections, the first of which deals with the recommendations made by the committee and the second with the recommendations made by the committee. The first section is divided into three parts, the first of which deals with the recommendations made by the committee and the second with the recommendations made by the committee. The second section is divided into two parts, the first of which deals with the recommendations made by the committee and the second with the recommendations made by the committee.

among the leaders of the psychedelic movement, the majority of papers are unbiased discussions of the effects of LSD and its implications for consciousness expansion. It is the best available source of readings on LSD.

Solomon, D. (Ed.) The Marijuana Papers. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

A companion piece to his previous edited collection of papers on LSD, this anthology contains many excellent papers on marijuana. In addition to scientific description and evaluations of marijuana are reprints of literary works on the subject. Editorial comments preceding each of the papers place them in historical context and, together with the editor's introduction, argue strongly for the reduction of legal control of this drug. The inclusion here of the La Guardia Commission report on marijuana makes this an especially valuable source of information about marijuana.

Psychiatric Descriptions of Some Hippie Types*

The case descriptions presented here were selected to provide a sampling of the personality types and patterns of drug use seen among the hippie population of the Haight-Ashbury. A number of these subjects denied that they were really hippies, as do many of the current residents of the Haight-Ashbury, but it is difficult to find them clearly distinguishable from those who admit their identification with the hippie ethos. In the light of the observations about the changes that have taken place in the Haight-Ashbury community since the summer of 1967, when these subjects were interviewed, it seems important to note that they do not appear to be significantly different in behavior, attitudes, drug use, or life history from the subjects who are currently being assessed by the Haight-Ashbury Research Project. However, the reader should be aware that these sketches are based on relatively brief interviews with each subject and that the material included here is not assumed to be adequate for a psychiatric evaluation of these individuals. The current work of the Haight-Ashbury Research Project includes considerably more detailed psychiatric and psychological descriptions of our subjects and will result in more complete histories and analyses than may be found in these illustrative sketches.

The cases are presented without comment or interpretation, but they have been grouped in terms of their predominant pattern of drug use. The first cases presented are users of psychedelic drugs, followed by users of amphetamines and, finally, followed by users of hard narcotics.

*These case descriptions are based on those prepared by Dr. James Allen during the summer of 1967. They are included here in preference to similar descriptions available through the Haight-Ashbury Research Project to minimize the possibility that any of the cases might be recognized by residents of the area. The names of subjects have been changed and other identifying data has been altered. Unfortunately, no adequate descriptions of female hippies were available for this presentation.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

The history of the United States is a story of growth and development. It begins with the first settlers who came to the shores of North America. These settlers were men of courage and vision who sought a new life in a new land. They were men who believed in the power of the individual and the strength of the community. They were men who were willing to risk everything for a better future. Their story is a story of triumph and adversity, of hope and despair. It is a story that has inspired generations of Americans and has shaped the course of our nation's history. The story of the United States is a story of the American dream, of the pursuit of happiness, of the quest for a better life. It is a story that has made us a nation of immigrants, a nation of people who have come from all over the world to seek a better life in America. The story of the United States is a story of the American spirit, of the American way of life, of the American dream. It is a story that has made us a nation of freedom, a nation of opportunity, a nation of hope. The story of the United States is a story that has made us a nation of greatness, a nation of power, a nation of influence. It is a story that has made us a nation of the future, a nation of the world.

The story of the United States is a story of the American dream, of the pursuit of happiness, of the quest for a better life. It is a story that has inspired generations of Americans and has shaped the course of our nation's history. The story of the United States is a story of the American spirit, of the American way of life, of the American dream. It is a story that has made us a nation of freedom, a nation of opportunity, a nation of hope. The story of the United States is a story that has made us a nation of greatness, a nation of power, a nation of influence. It is a story that has made us a nation of the future, a nation of the world.

Case No. 1: Earl.

Earl is a well-developed, clean, long-haired 20-year-old Jewish youth from New York City. He came to San Francisco three months ago because, "I just couldn't take my mother and sisters anymore; every time they looked at me they would be hurt because I wasn't what they wanted." Earl states that he is not a hippie, "If by that you mean the kind of person who won't work and wanders up and down Haight Street all day, saying, 'Look at me, I made it to the Haight-Ashbury,' and loudly proclaiming, 'I love you,' while he steals you blind. No, I'm not that; I'm not employed now but I can be. I like to give as well as receive. I want to do my thing and let the other guy do his. If that is what you mean by hippie, then I am a hippie. I don't need the Haight-Ashbury and I'll go on when it is no more, for the Haight-Ashbury cannot be destroyed, since it was never created. It exists within, its core is in the individual soul."

Mental Status:

Earl shows no disorder in thought form and his affect is appropriate. His memory is good. Intellectually, he appears to fall within the normal range.

Personal History:

Earl is the youngest in a family of four. He has one brother, 13 years his senior, "Who really acted like my father should have. I never really knew my dad, but my brother really fathered me. He is the one person I can talk to...He can understand me and listen to what I say. My sisters and mother just look at my long hair and feel hurt. 'Where did we fail,' they say.

"I really like my mother and regret the way she feels, but she and the rest think I should wear a suit, and nice shoes, and hold a job and all that. That's what she wants -- so she looks at me, my long hair, my dungarees, and bare feet and cries. I just couldn't take it any longer. I can't be what they want -- understand? So, that's why I came out here.

"I've written lots of letters but only posted one. I can't say I got high on acid or that I went to the survival school -- that would just hurt them and

they wouldn't understand. So, it's real hard to write.

"I tried to say, 'Look, Ma, I'm me,' but she just cried and said, to think I was hers and how ashamed she'd be that her son turned out so. But I don't really feel guilty -- regret and pride, yes, but not guilt -- but, then, I wonder if maybe I should feel guilty. What do you think?"

Earl has one year of college and has worked from time to time as a minor business official, "But that's not for me. If I want to go up to the park and talk to people, that's what I want to do. Sometimes I want to stay up late and talk, but my family says, 'What do you want to stay up all night for, talking. You should go to bed so you can get up; and around a candle, yet? And then you sleep all day.' So I don't see anything wrong with that. Why should I go to bed at an exact time and get up at an exact time just because someone says I'm supposed to? That is just not for me, understand? Maybe I'll get a job; right now, I'm unemployed but I'm not going to stand and beg from tourists unless I have to and I don't have to."

Earl has taken LSD and pot because it was a new experience. "I wanted to use it to open up, to explore more what was in me, but I don't have to take it. I'm sure not going to take the stuff that's on the street now."

Earl has had a few heterosexual experiences that were pleasurable. At present, he lives with a number of other hippies in a loose communal arrangement.

In summary, Earl appears to be a normal adolescent who has come to the Haight-Ashbury in an attempt to live his own life, as opposed to the life his family, and in particular, his mother, wished for him. It is my impression that from the Haight-Ashbury he will gain a sense of his own ability to take care of himself, of being master of his own ship and that, in time, he will return to New York, strengthened by his experience here.

Subscription prices: Five dollars per annum in advance. Single copies, fifteen cents. Payment in advance. All communications should be addressed to the Editor, The Journal of the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, May 2, 1912, under post office number 383, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement of post office and postmaster.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on March 1, 1918. Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in advance. This journal is published weekly, except on Sundays and public holidays, when it is published bi-weekly. The subscription price is \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies, fifteen cents. Payment in advance. All communications should be addressed to the Editor, The Journal of the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1919, by The American Medical Association

Published by The American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Subscription prices: Five dollars per annum in advance. Single copies, fifteen cents. Payment in advance. All communications should be addressed to the Editor, The Journal of the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, May 2, 1912, under post office number 383, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement of post office and postmaster.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on March 1, 1918. Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Case No. 2: Richard.

Richard is a tall, well-developed 23-year-old youth who came to the Haight-Ashbury to find out, "What is going on."

He is cleanly dressed, albeit unshaven; his hair is long and his clothes are of a type appropriate for the area. He is wearing a necklace of Indian beads and an Indian headband. He does not consider himself as a hippie but feels he's beginning to get that way, defining the term as one, "Who helps and is really interested in what's going on and happens to other people." He has become especially interested in what happens to a girl he met in Golden Gate Park and who is a speed freak, fearing for her because she is so anxious and frightened and sad.

Mental Status:

Richard shows no disorder in thought form, or content. His affect is appropriate. His memory is good. His intellectual level would probably fall within the normal range, although initial contact with him would suggest it to be in the superior range.

Personal History:

Richard was born in Ohio, and is the second of four children. His relationship with his mother seems to have fluctuated considerably between intensity and rejection. He sees her as intelligent but demanding and controlling. His relationship with his father seems to have never been good; he regards his father as being for all practical purposes a nonentity.

Richard has a high school education. He claims to have spent some time in the Army as a demolition expert and to have been employed in this capacity since he left the service; however, he left this job about a year ago because, "I'd heard about the homosexuals of Hollywood and I wanted to go and see for myself. I did and I've written part of a book on them. Then I heard about the scene here-- so I came here to see what's going on."

Richard has no plans for the future, other than possibly to finish his book on homosexuals; he sees himself as becoming a second Hemingway, but as yet he has

published nothing.

Richard has had a few overt homosexual experiences since his late teens. In the past, he would occasionally hustle and apparently had hoped to support himself this way while in Los Angeles; however, he does not see himself as "queer."

Since coming to the Haight-Ashbury three months ago, Richard has lived in a commune with about eight other people. He seems to have stayed there longer than any of the members. He supports himself by panhandling and occasionally selling papers. Occasionally, he eats at his commune. Often, he eats what others hand him on the street or attends the feedings of the Diggers, or at the Hearth, or at Glide Memorial Church.

For the past three years, Richard has taken drugs occasionally. He first smoked pot, being introduced to it by friends at a party. He enjoys it because it makes him feel relaxed and happy. Since coming to the Haight-Ashbury, he has taken LSD about twelve times and STP twice -- in order to really understand, "What's going on with people and especially this chick, who's really far out. She takes speed and I'm way behind her, man, but I figure that if I take more speed then I can catch up and reach her." Although he feels LSD and STP have both helped in achieving this, making it possible to "almost tune in on her vibrations," he feels that meth offers an even better tool, for it, "Makes me think fast and really groove with it and I've got to get there fast or I'm going to lose her and I really want to reach her, for she needs help." He feels that the drugs have made him feel more concerned about others and less encapsulated.

In summary, I think that Richard can best be classed now as a character disorder. He seems to have reached a genital level of development; however, his sexual acts are primarily homosexual in nature, although this is denied and rationalized. His major defenses seem to be denial and rationalization, although this does not prevent considerable acting out. He appears to identify primarily with his mother and his relationship with his friend in the park is a mothering one. He sees himself as clever, handsome and artistic, a great writer -- but as yet

has not been productive. In the past, his object relationships seem to have been superficial, fragile and to have involved using people. This seems to have changed with his interest in the girl he has met here.

It is my suspicion that, had I seen Richard a few months ago, I would have felt he could best be classified as a sociopathic personality; however, at present, there is not enough data to support this diagnosis. It may also be that, as he says he has begun to change since coming here, whether it is the result of LSD, the environment, or age, he now seems to have established for the first time in his life a relationship where he seems to care what happens to someone else. Whether this change in object relationships is permanent or disappears, however, is open to question.

Richard came to the Haight-Ashbury for excitement, presumably the same desire that led him to Hollywood and to become a demolition expert, but now he is staying because of a feeling he needs to take care of someone.

Case No. 3: Alan.

Alan is a 21-year-old youth from the Midwest. He wears a leather Indian headband to hold back his long blonde hair. He considers himself a "hippie," defining the term as, "One who really cares about what happens to others." He came to the Haight-Ashbury hoping to find more people capable of love here: "Sometimes I thought that I was the only person in the world capable of love."

Mental Status:

Alan shows a marked disorder in thought form, frequently blocking. His affect is inappropriate. His memory is good. His intellectual level appears to fall within the upper normal range.

Personal History:

An only child, Alan is the son of a, "Physically strong but really passive, weak man," and a dominating, controlling mother.

As a child, he was usually alone and fantasized constantly about being the only person in the world who was alive -- all others were dead or puppets.

Alan went to college in hopes of becoming a minister; however, he did not finish college. He came to San Francisco about two years ago and since that time has worked in the Post Office.

Sexually, Alan is attracted to males and finds that he is constantly being propositioned; however, he fears homosexuality, for that, "Is death; it leads nowhere." Consequently, he has forced himself to set up living arrangements with a series of girls. These relationships, however, have been unsatisfactory and he has felt very frustrated. "Sometimes I feel as if I'm the only person in the world who can love; I give and give and get nothing back. I just feel empty. Why can't someone love me?"

Since coming to the Haight-Ashbury, he has used LSD on about six occasions, "To see if I could get hold of my problems -- but now I'm beginning to think that acid just is confusing me more now." Consequently, he has given up the use of drugs -- with the exception of Thorazine, which a psychiatrist prescribed for him.

He hopes, eventually, to get to be able to, "Feel with people, to meet a girl where I just won't have to give and give and where we both can give and receive love."

When he dies, he hopes to be cremated. He does not want anyone to be present: "I don't really accept concern from others."

Since coming to the Haight-Ashbury, he feels he has grown more accepting of people. "I used to be very, very critical but now I can live and let live." His parents recently visited him and, to his surprise, he found he could even accept them as people. He felt that, although at first horrified by his hair and dress, they later came to even approve of his present way of life.

In summary, I think Alan can best be called an undifferentiated schizophrenic. His major ego defects at present are in the areas of thinking and affectivity. He feels confused and alienated. His object relations are dis-

tant and unsatisfactory and he equates girls with his mother. He shows considerable confusion in sexual identity. His conscience seems harsh and punitive but apparently less so now than in the past. His main defenses are intellectualization, fantasy and projection.

It appears that he came to the Haight-Ashbury seeking people who could love and possibly reach through to him. He had heard this was the city of love -- and had hopes. In some ways, these hopes have not been met, but since becoming a hippie his conscience has become somewhat more lenient so that he is both more accepting of others and of himself.

It is also apparent that Alan can hold a job here and be accepted by others, despite a marked disorder in thought form and in affect. Because of the frequent use of LSD, these defects are less noticeable here than they would be elsewhere, indeed, the community is more accepting of this sort of psychopathology.

While for him his long hair and wearing necklaces may represent a certain amount of sexual identity confusion, this, too, is acceptable; indeed, even a "sign of grace," in the Haight-Ashbury.

Case No. 4: Jose

Jose is a well-developed 25-year-old who generally wears an Indian head band and necklaces. He is of Mexican-American origin and looks upon himself as a hippie; indeed, as a sort of hippie leader. He is reluctant to define the term hippie, seeing this as a labeling and thereby doing an injustice to people, and as evidence of not accepting people as individuals for what they are, who they are, each individually unique.

Mental Status:

Jose shows no gross disorder in thought. His memory is good. His intellectual level appears to fall within the bright normal range. His affect is appropriate.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
5301 SOUTH CAMPUS DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637
TEL: 773-936-5000
FAX: 773-936-5000
WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

1. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

2. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

3. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

4. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

5. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

6. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

7. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

8. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

9. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

10. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

11. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

12. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

13. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

14. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

15. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

16. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

17. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

18. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

19. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

20. The following information is for your information only. It is not intended to be used as a basis for any legal action.

Personal History:

Born in Arizona of lower socio-economic status, Jose is the second child in a family of four. He seems never to have been close to either parent and generally to have spent a childhood feeling as if he were a second-rate citizen.

He completed the ninth grade. He was arrested for joy riding. This arrest led to a series of runaways. Again, he was arrested for possession of grass.

Jose has been living in a commune and associated with a hippie group for about the past year. He works part time, usually stoned. He sees himself as a leader in the hippie group in his area, usually acting as a contact in obtaining drugs and often acting as a guide during trips. He sees himself as a kind of turn-on change artist, and a charismatic figure.

Jose first smoked pot. In the course of time, he has tried most drugs but prefers LSD and cocaine. He originally took them "to be high," but feels now that they have a spiritual significance. On his trips he frequently experiences his own martyrdom through such things as burning at the stake, and his rebirth -- as a kind of god; however, he also takes one of these drugs almost daily, preferring to work stoned because it goes faster and the work is more interesting, the colors brighter, the sounds more intense. He is now able to control his hallucinations and is able to function as a waiter while high. He refers to the psychedelics as sacraments, and to grass as holy. He considers that, since taking drugs, his personality has changed in that he has become more accepting, open, and intimate; in the past, he apparently has been arrested on a number of occasions for fighting.

In summary, this 25-year-old could probably be best categorized as a character disorder. He apparently has been jailed at least twice -- for possession of pot and for car theft -- and arrested a number of other times for fighting. His interpersonal relationships seem never to have been close or rewarding and his early self-concept seems to have been one of a second-rate

person looked down upon because of racial extraction and socio-economic status.

As a hippie, however, Jose has found a more satisfying identity -- that of charismatic guru among people who look up to him for drugs and for advice. This seems to be reflected, too, in a number of LSD experiences -- the martyrdom and rebirth of the hero god. Although he considers himself a leader, he really does not lead, but stands in his position of honor because of his experience with drugs and general knowledge of life in an illegal society.

Case No. 5: Miles

Miles is a 23-year-old thin, long-haired youth who considers himself a hippie, defining the term to mean, "One who really cares about what happens to others and tries to help them."

Mental Status:

Miles shows no gross disorder in thought form. His affect is appropriate. His memory is good. His intelligence appears to fall within the normal range. He was released from the Army as "emotionally immature."

Personal History:

Miles is the only son of parents who divorced shortly after he was born. He was raised by his mother, to whom he still feels very closely attached, although he regards her as stupid and gross. His father has been seen only rarely, but he regards him as being strong, practical and intelligent.

Miles has spent one semester at a junior college, quitting because he wasn't interested in what was being taught. He now has decided to return to school, in order to eventually become a doctor.

He spent a few months in the Army but eventually was discharged as "emotionally immature." "Really, I just wanted out. I wanted to go home to my mother, to my chick who was balling everybody in town. So I just hid in corners and looked, and whenever they gave me hell, I cried -- that really blew their minds."

Miles has engaged in a few relatively satisfactory homosexual activities, but has generally found them unsatisfactory. At age 19 he married, but this marriage led to divorce, as he frequently struck his wife, particularly when she refused or was unable to get him drugs. At present, he spends most of his time finding girls whom he feels are attracted to drugs and is busy balling as many as possible. He seems more interested in the numbers and the telling of his exploits to his male friends than in the girls.

During the past two years, Miles has taken drugs a number of times. For about one year, he took methedrine almost daily with occasional "binges" which lasted for about a week and during which he took it three to four times daily. He stopped because he felt it made him aggressive and paranoid, and consequently had led to his wife leaving him. At present he takes LSD and STP to open up the wonders of the mind. "Everything you need to know is there...You just have to get in tune with it. Now I am going on to find out all about Indian philosophy. They're doing great things there. I'm beginning to learn to control my ability to concentrate."

Miles claims to be a rock and roll drummer, but to have given this up, "The great love of my life," as a sacrifice to help increase his "kharma."

Miles considers himself as inadequate. From his early years of school, he was told that he was stupid. He grew up feeling out of things. Apparently, he was rather awkward and had trouble playing baseball with the other children; this intensified his feeling of being out of things. In coming to the Haight-Ashbury, he has found that he can be accepted by a group and has devoted himself to helping others who are having bad trips. "For the first time, I have found I can really help people and do a good job." He has also identified himself closely with a local Hindu priest, finding therein, "The Answer." He also frequently refers to people looking at him in such terms as, "Why do they come and make a big deal about our long hair when they have been following Christ for years?"

On occasion, he takes excessive pride in his abilities as a therapist, demeaning medical therapists.

In summary, it is my impression that Miles can best be classified as an immature personality. For the first few weeks I knew him, he was constantly stoned on acid and STP; this, coupled with his interest in Eastern philosophy, led me to an initial diagnostic impression of schizophrenia; however, I believe this to be incorrect. For a period, he also seems to have shown effects of excessive methedrine use, although this is not now obvious. He has had difficulty in leaving his mother and, although he has shown no overt homosexual activity, his heterosexual activity has served mainly as a proof of his virility to other males. He considers himself weak physically, and inadequate emotionally. His superego, as exemplified in his "sacrifice," seems demanding but capable of appeasement. His reality testing may be questioned; his impulse control is not always adequate. His major ego defenses are denial, projection and rationalization. His object relationships seem frugal and superficial.

Case No. 6: David.

David is a 22-year-old Negro youth born in San Francisco. He does not consider himself a hippie, defining the term as a "group of long-haired, white kids with no shoes." He does, however, consider himself a speed freak, having taken the drug more or less continually for the past four years.

David is well developed, neatly dressed, and clean. He moved about frequently, peering down the hall and out the window. He showed a marked disorder in thought form, switching rapidly from topic to topic. He was convinced that some Negro was after him and had arranged for him to be beaten up. The dispute between them had arisen as a result of a quarrel at a meth party a week previously. He had occasional illusions but was always able to question these experiences. He was, on the one hand, eager to face his supposed persecutors and challenge them, and on the other hand, he was aware that his attitude was probably the

result of taking methedrine. "All speed freaks are paranoid." His memory was good. His intellectual level appeared to fall within the bright normal superior range. His affect was labile and he alternated rapidly between being frightened and grandiose, sad and euphoric.

Personal History:

David is the oldest boy and first child in a family of five. His father is a heroin addict, and is unemployed. His mother is a dominating woman who has long done day labor in support of the family. She generally acts as a martyr, constantly reiterating the theme, "life is terrible."

David has some college education. He writes poetry and considers himself talented in this area. He has generally worked in a printing factory, but can make only \$1.35 an hour at this work. In the summer, however, he has also worked as a "youth counsellor," a job he especially enjoys -- his description of the position, however, would suggest that he acted as a kind of custodian in a boys' camp.

David has been taking drugs since his early teens -- having an example in his father. Approximately four months ago, however, because "his wife" had decided to leave him, he withdrew from heroin; however, since that time, he has continued to take methedrine daily.

His usual habit is to take methedrine a number of times daily with friends. This leads to 3-4 days of increasingly greater drug dosage, then a few days of semi-stupor or sleep. When first seen, he had not slept in four days. About the second day of the "meth party," he had quarreled with another speed freak and had asked the latter to leave the apartment. This was the man from whom he now feared vengeance. In addition to his speed runs, he also takes meth whenever he feels slighted or the victim of injustice, a condition which occurs frequently, for racial reasons.

David feels that he is weak. "As a kid, I could always be beaten up by the stronger boys -- but speed makes me feel strong and powerful. It also sharpens

my understanding, lets me be more aware of things and feel closer to others."

David seems to have no close relationships. He apparently never felt close to his parents. He has a child by a woman he lives with and calls "wife", but when she went on vacation three weeks ago he promptly moved in with another woman, whom he now complains, "Does not love me. I got to be told I am loved -- all the time. But I don't feel close to people; I feel closer to animals -- but with drugs I can feel close to people."

David has no plans for the future, "Other than to get people to love me." He has no desire to give up drugs, although he is aware that he is paranoid and, "All speed freaks are paranoid."

In summary, David is an intelligent Negro youth who has been addicted to heroin and who now is dependent on methedrine. He shows some of the characteristic features of long-term meth use -- emotional lability, illusions and paranoid thinking. His main defenses appear to be projection, intellectualization, and rationalization. His object relationships seem to be dependent, superficial and ambivalent. He strives to feel closer to people but can do this only under the influence of drugs. He sees himself as isolated and weak, but bright and talented. He has strong oral conflicts, centering around his need to be loved -- even should he need to force it from the other. His conscience appears to be lenient and indulgent.

Case No. 7: Michael.

Michael is a gaunt, dishevelled, and rather dirty 21-year-old who came to San Francisco from New York three months ago. He apparently had come to attend a brother's wedding in Berkeley, but finding drugs readily available in the Haight-Ashbury, he stayed on. He does not consider himself a "hippie" and, indeed, was unaware of the hippie movement, although he had been in the area for two weeks when first seen. "It's just a place where one can get drugs. Drugs should be free, like they are in England. You should be able to go into a room just filled

with methedrine and be able to 'shoot' all day long."

Michael is dirty, barefoot and poorly dressed. His short hair is uncombed. Unlike most of the people on the street, he looks degraded. He moves rapidly and jerkily. He talks in short sentences, but the subject becomes vague. However, it usually return to methedrine. His affect is one of suspicion and hostility. He often has auditory and visual hallucinations. Memory is fair. His intellectual level would appear to fall within the low normal range.

Michael lives on the street, staying a night with fellow speed freaks or spending a night in a laundromat. Occasionally, he steals food or drugs. From time to time, he goes to the Medical Clinic, where he tries to crash or to rummage about for amphetamines. He has some high school education, but no training for any job and states he has no wish for any training. He intends to stay in the area and live as he does as long as drugs are available.

Michael has no close friends. From time to time, he joins forces briefly with other speed freaks to get drugs or to crash; however, his relationships with such people are chiefly exploitive.

He has been taking drugs for over two years. He began in New York with heroin, taking it because it gave a great hot flash, and then, "Blanked you out." He withdrew when the supply became less available, and since then he has used amphetamines daily, taking them orally and, preferably, intravenously. Since coming to San Francisco he has also taken LSD about every second week and STP four or five times, but feels these drugs are inferior to meth -- which really, "Blanks you out."

Objectively, when "high on speed," he often covers his face in terror of his hallucinations and dashes about in an uncoordinated, agitated fashion. It becomes impossible to communicate with him for more than a few seconds before he rushes away or strikes out. When he is not high, he is withdrawn and suspicious, frequently staring into space, and rudely resentful of one's presence.

In short, Michael now presents with what clinically could be classified as a schizophrenic reaction of a paranoid type. How much this is secondary to prolonged excessive use of amphetamines and how much the drug intake is secondary to the schizophrenia cannot presently be ascertained. After observation of him periodically for one month, it is my feeling that Michael is basically schizophrenic and the drug dependence is secondary.

Michael's ego functioning is grossly interfered with; his sense of reality and reality testing are poor. His impulse control is poor and even the autonomous functions of the ego -- motility, perception, memory -- have been interfered with. His object relationships are fragile, primitive and exist only for the immediate gratification of his most pressing needs -- drugs.

Michael is one of a number of people who use the hippies. In his case, their presence means easy availability of drugs and the possibility of shelter. He is only vaguely aware of their existence, other than as a potential source of gratification for his most pressing needs.

Case No. 8: Edward.

Edward is a 21-year old, well-developed youth, six-feet tall, who sports beads and an Indian headband. He has come to the Haight-Ashbury and remained here because he feels that there is, "No place else for me to go, unless I get myself admitted to a mental hospital -- anyplace but Atascadero; I sure don't want to go back there, but the others are okay."

Edward was apparently abandoned by his parents and raised in a number of foster homes, forming no close attachment to anyone and identifying more with institutions than with people.

He has some high school education, but this is very little as he ran away at age fourteen. Since that time, he has been on the streets, living as best he could. "Since fourteen, I've had no home, no place to stay and have spent

almost every night on the street, in a doorway or in a laundromat." He has also set up a series of brief child-parent relationships with people who take care of him for awhile, but "They don't like me." He sometimes supports himself by briefly held jobs; selling papers, panhandling and, on occasion, by stealing small things.

Edward has taken drugs for most of the time since he was fourteen. He takes any pill he can find, stimulant or depressant, and often together. Many of these he steals from drugstores. He has taken LSD and STP a number of times in the past year; however, his favorite drugs remain heroin and methedrine. He uses them for "kicks" -- "to feel a flash, then really blank out." This is the experience he seeks in all drugs, whether stimulant or depressant. The hallucinogens are used only to get "stoned", defined by him as to "blank things out." He can now obtain many of these effects through the use of pot, alone.

History of Past Health:

Edward has had no serious illnesses. He has three times made suicidal gestures with overdoses of drugs. Although these seem to have been largely and consciously attempts to force people to take care of him, nevertheless, he has taken dangerously large quantities. He has reportedly been twice hospitalized at Atascadero State Hospital.

Edward came to the Haight-Ashbury because, "Why not...I have no place to go, nothing to do." Here, he has supported himself by occasionally selling Oracles and by panhandling. He early spent much time hanging about free areas, such as the Diggers store and the various "coffeehouses" run by church groups. For the past five weeks, however, he has been a member of a commune, having been taken in by a motherly girl who ran it and who has given him a kind of unconditional acceptance. In this atmosphere, he has reduced his drug intake, now taking meth, I.V., only one or two times a week, usually the same day. In deference to her, he does not take it in the commune.

Mental Status:

Edward is a downtrodden looking young man with a rather flat aspect. It is difficult to feel close to him. He shows no gross defect in thought form, and generally not in content. Sensorium is clear, memory good. His intellectual level appears to fall within the lower normal range.

On one occasion, I was asked to see him following one of his meth binges. He was very paranoid, having placed three knives about the room, as well as a hacksaw. He had also placed numerous small mirrors about, so that he could instantly be aware of anyone who entered. He was uncertain as to who might be of danger to him, but he suspected that someone might. At this time, he was also extremely hungry, eating three pies and consuming two quarts of chocolate milk.

In summary, I think Edward can best be described as manifesting the effects of early maternal deprivation. Although from his history it is impossible to ascertain exactly what did happen to him as a child, he now shows a kind of bland emotional distance, inability to form close relationships, lax superego standards which easily permit stealing and a concrete thinking based on moment to moment needs. Even when he complains, "I have nothing, no one, no place," there is a peculiar lack of depressive feeling that comes across.

It would be easy to hypothesize that, for Edward, the taking of drugs -- any drugs -- serves either to blank out or to break through his peculiar emotional state: He talks only of the "hot flash" and of blanking out. It may be, in psychoanalytic terms, that these drugs also represent an attempt to return to the child-mother state.

Although Edward does not consider himself a hippie, he dresses like one and appears to act like one in many respects -- he panhandles, takes drugs, and lives in a commune. In general, he seems to be regarded by the hippies as someone to be taken care of, a "crasher" or a "speed freak." He himself, unlike most hippies, does not talk of "love, development, learning, religion", or of "flowing with it", but rather of, "flashes and blowing out."

The Haight-Ashbury Research Project

The Haight-Ashbury Research Project, which officially commenced its work on June 15, 1968, was designed to study the psychological and sociological characteristics of members of the Haight-Ashbury hippie community. The Project is funded by the Center for Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse of the National Institute of Mental Health through a research grant awarded to Dr. Robert Wallerstein, Chief of the Department of Psychiatry of Mt. Zion Hospital. The professional staff of the Project consists of a team of psychiatrists, psychologists, and social scientists whose interests range over a variety of topics relevant to an understanding of drug users and their culture. Various staff members have been involved in previous research activities dealing with the concerns of this Project, and all of them share an interest in obtaining a clinical description of the personality characteristics of our subjects. The Project is currently funded for two years, but anticipates receiving additional funding for a five year follow-up study of subjects seen during the first two years.

Although the various aspects of the Project are not independent of one another in terms of either data collection or analysis, a breakdown of our interests into the following six content areas best describes the major objectives of our research:

1. Background

A psychological and sociological description of the hippies in terms of family background and life experience.

2. Current Psychological Status

An assessment of their personality characteristics, ideological commitments, and moral values.

3. Natural History

A description of the "careers" of many different hippies centering on their patterns of motivation and commitment, the channels through which they enter the culture, the activities which typify their life in the community, and what they will do in the next few years.

4. Community and Culture

A description and analysis of the Haight-Ashbury community in terms of its organization, social structure, patterns of communication, friendship, rituals, and culture heroes. And a comparison of the hippie movement with other youth cultures, protest movements, and Utopian communities.

5. Drug Effects

An evaluation of the effects of psychedelic and other drugs on personality and attitudes, as well as a study of the different personality patterns associated with different patterns of drug use.

6. Community Needs and Resources

A broad survey of the health and welfare needs and resources of the Haight-Ashbury community, and its utilization of existing community social resources, and the determination of the kind and array of health and welfare facilities that would meet the great needs of the community in ways that would be acceptable and therefore used.

Each of the approximately 250 subjects who will participate in this Project will be given a comprehensive battery of interviews, projective and objective tests of personality, and research instruments designed to assess relevant dimensions of background factors, current psychological status, and future plans. The initial results of our pilot study of 70 individuals which has just been completed suggests that we will have a rich store of information about hippies within the next few years.

642-2511

RETURN PUBLIC HEALTH LIBRARY

TO →

42 Warren Hall

642-2511

LOAN PERIOD 1	2	3
SEMESTER		
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAY

ALL JOURNALS ARE NON-RENEWABLE

Return to desk from which borrowed

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

SEMI-MONTHLY LOAN		
MAY 24 1997	ONE MONTH LOAN	
	MAY - 9 2001	
REC'D PUBL APR 1 1998	SUBJECT TO RECALL	
SEMESTER LOAN	REC'D PUBL APR 25 '01	
	ONE MONTH LOAN	
MAY 23 1998	MAY 23 2002	
SUBJECT TO RECALL	SUBJECT TO RECALL	
RECEIVED	REC'D PUBL MAY 30 '02	
JUL 15 1998		
CIRC. DEPT.	APR 05 2010	
REC'D PUBL JUL 16 '98		

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

FORM NO. DD26-7, 9m, 11/94

BERKELEY, CA 94720

PUBLIC HEALTH LIBRARY

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C029371721

